Durham E-Theses

Structural reform in higher education: the changing role and status of the university college sector

Rhodes, Malcolm

Structural Reform in Higher Education: The Changing Role and Status of the University College Sector

by

Malcolm Rhodes

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

School of Education

The University of Durham

1999

2 3 MAY 2000

Abstract

This thesis examines the nature of structural reform of higher education in England with a particular focus on the changing policy environment of the role and status of the University College sector. The study explores the extent to which political and status considerations have determined the shape of the sector and the interrelationship of institutions within it. It is argued that the pressure to reform the structure of the higher education sector in response to profound economic, political, social, cultural, educational and demographic changes has confronted the traditional value systems and structures of an elite system. The debate relating to the legitimate use of the University College title and the attendant issues relating to institutional title and status encapsulates this conflict of interest and neglects the historical development and growth of the sector. It is argued that the failure of two recent major Committees of Inquiry and successive policy-makers to implement systematic structural reform of higher education in order to promote greater social justice, meritocratic social mobility and educational opportunity, and simultaneously to resolve the anomalies of institutional positioning (which reflect both the elite values of the existing sector and the legacy of the piecemeal and unstructured historical development of higher education), has perpetuated the confusion of institutional status and has generated a policy conflict whose ambiguities threaten the fulfilment of the lifelong learning agenda and the future success of individual institutional providers of higher education beyond the mainstream university sector.

Declaration

This thesis results entirely from my own work and has not been offered previously
in candidature for any other degree or diploma.

Acknowledgement

I am unable here fully to express, but merely record, the debt which I owe to my wife, Christine, for her understanding, patience and support throughout.

My warmest thanks go to Keith Morrison, whose continuing insight, depth of understanding and guidance made this work a joyful and rewarding labour.

My thanks are also due to all my colleagues in the higher education sector, particularly my closest colleagues at University College Warrington, who gave unstintingly of their time to discuss these issues with me and were unfailingly helpful and responsive during the course of this study.

Contents

5   The University Colleges

CHAPTER 1

THE CHANGING SHAPE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

1.1   Introduction

Between the end of the nineteenth century and the 1950s the nature and character of British

higher education remained largely unchanged.   During the greater part of the nineteenth

century there emerged

> '....*a more self-conscious attitude to the role of the university in producing*
> *an elite of character as well as knowledge....(involving)....systems of*
> *selection which by formal rule or practical necessity made the possession of*
> *a degree an essential of admission.'*
>
> (Caine, 1969: 27).

Such systems were characterised by the aristocracy of wealth, sharing effective political

power with the aristocracy of birth, and to both attendance at a university was a normal

final preparation for the responsibilities of adult life.

The system was stratified with social closure and sponsored, restricted mobility reflecting a

privileged elite consciously manipulating the system to suit its interests, whose members

sought to preserve their position as inheritors of cultural capital within the broader context

of social and economic reproduction (Muller, Ringer and Simon, 1988).   This supported a

prestige hierarchy bequeathed by historical development (Anderson, 1992).   Although this

hierarchy continues to survive, since 1945 and particularly since the Robbins era, its effects

have been subject to progressively increasing criticism from numerous different

perspectives, including: those with a commitment to egalitarianism who wish to see

opportunity and access as the defining principles of higher education (Trow 1964; 1987; 1989; 1991; Robertson 1995); those who maintain that the existing structure and approach is critically damaging to the competitiveness and potential success of the British economy - a view which has been expressed for several decades (Zuckerman 1958; DES, 1985; Esland, 1991); (I) and those who believe that the existing system has contributed to a significant social failure, embodying values which appear incomprehensible and irrelevant to the mass population (Scott, 1984; Lee, 1996).

The progressively intensifying post-war debate regarding the size, shape, structure and funding of higher education has confirmed, however, the extent to which the structural development of the sector has been determined less by a rationality borne of clear educational or even economic priorities than by political and status considerations which are endemic in British higher education and a central feature of its history.

The historical development of the higher education system has been dominated by the tendency towards the imposition of a rigid social stratification on university selection and of an aristocratic value system on the development of particular disciplines (Shattock, 1996) and, while the sector has been subject to rapid and radical change over the last thirty years, such changes have occurred in the 'external' life of the sector in matters such as finance, governance and structure while the 'internal' issues of values and purpose, of what is taught, how it is taught and to whom, have resisted these pressures. As a result,

> '....the external and internal worlds are now out of balance. The external changes have produced a mass higher education system whilst the lack of internal change has resulted in the retention of values of an elitist system'
> (Wagner, 1995: 15)

2

The difficulties of adaptation which have confronted the higher education sector since the early 1960s have arisen from a series of political, economic, social and educational pressures which have progressively compelled the development of a mass system within a structure which remains elitist in its values. This is not to imply a false linearity or regularity to these developments since this would mask the subtleties and range of priorities which characterise the experience of British universities and colleges particularly in the 1990s. The transformation of the higher education system throughout the post-Robbins era has been fitful, at times intense, always complex, and remains incomplete (Scott,1995a).

1.2 The Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education

The transition from elite to mass higher education has become the widely accepted interpretive framework within which the rapid and radical changes to the higher education system have been viewed during these eventful decades. Yet, despite the fundamental changes in the public life of higher education as identified by Wagner (1995), the rhythms of its private life have provided an underlying continuity in which, from a strong ideological position, skilfully evidenced, Scott argues

> *'British higher education has become a mass system in its public structures but remains elite in its private instincts.'*
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 2).

The process of the reform of the structure of higher education which has formed part of an ideological debate and a continuing political agenda, particularly in the last thirty years, has seen the demands of social justice, democratic expansion, equality of opportunity and economic efficiency to varying degrees subordinated to the considerations of status,

hierarchy and self-preservation to form a permanent and debilitating homeostasis which continues to impair the capacity of the higher education system to meet the educational, social and economic demands of the early decades of the new millennium.

Some commentators (Trow, 1964; 1987; 1989; 1998; Wagner, 1995; Scott, 1995a; Coffield and Williamson, 1997b) have pursued a clear political agenda throughout the recent debate, arguing that higher education has expanded without fundamental alteration to the elitist model on which it was founded and without significant change to the social class gradients of educational opportunity, with the universities

> '....carrying the history of this social exclusivity like a dead weight and a constant reproach severely limiting their capacity to adapt their curricula to respond to new kinds of students and to government pressures to widen their role with regard to both public services and private industry. '

> (Coffield and Williamson, 1997b : 6).

Notwithstanding the political and ideological motivations of these commentators, it is clear that several personal, political, philosophical, educational and economic agenda are coinciding to question the capacity of the existing structure of British higher education to accommodate, or even subscribe to the lifelong learning agenda. Furthermore, the prevailing, though profoundly threatened model of higher education constantly recalls the institutions and structures of the past to resolve the sector-wide organisational issues posed by the rapid expansion of participation rates. This atavism, evidenced by the view of the pre-1992 universities within CVCP which regarded the admission to their ranks of the former polytechnics as a breach of their traditional dominance and damaging to the quality and standards of higher education on which their reputation was founded (and on which it

depended), conflicts with the progressive diversification of institutional form which increasingly characterises the higher education sector. Consequently (and somewhat paradoxically), this diversification has been accompanied by an intensification of hierarchy among institutions (since markets thrive on variety and choice) creating a more elaborate pyramid of prestige (Halsey, 1995) which constantly reinforces the polarisation of economic and social groups and which has become increasingly marked within the last decade (Hutton, 1995). It is notable that in the midst of the expansion of higher education which was designed, in part at least, to increase access and widen participation to involve hitherto under-represented groups, the reputational gradient which distinguishes institutions according to implicit and often unexpressed status criteria has significantly steepened, (2) and

> *'...participation in higher education...remains circumscribed by notions of quality and exclusivity.'*
> (Robertson and Hillman, 1997. Para. 3.5: 58).

The pressures upon the existing university system emanate from a range of developments including: the globalisation of the educational market in which, through the use of information technology, geographical location no longer offers barriers to students pursuing elite educational opportunities; the shrinking of the catchment area making universities increasingly aware of the importance of relationships with the local community but without the mechanisms in place to promote such links (Goddard, 1993); the proliferation of sources of knowledge in which research centres and industrial laboratories, independent of universities, are creating a new research paradigm which is transdisciplinary, heterogeneous, transient, non-hierarchical, non-institutional, socially

accountable and reflexive (Gibbons *et.al.*, 1994); and the concept of lifelong learning (Faure *et.al.*, 1972) which requires higher education to develop a definition of education in which undergraduate studies are an integral part of a continuing learning sequence across the whole life span (Fryer, 1997). These developments represent a fragmentation, a loss of prestige, status and exclusivity, and a challenge to traditional sources of undisputed authority which are deemed to be the characteristics of the current higher education system according to postmodern analysts (Bain, 1995; Peters, 1995; Smith and Webster, 1997).

These developments are set against a background of expansion combined with the progressive erosion of the resource base, often euphemistically described as efficiency gains, in which, between 1964 and 1992, the age participation rate at 18 years increased fourfold from 8% to 33%, and between 1988/89 and 1993/4 the total number of home students increased by 66% for full-time courses and by 33% for part-time courses (CVCP, 1995) in parallel with an estimated reduction of 30% in the unit of resource per student and severe cuts in (and finally the abandonment of) capital spending on higher education (Coffield and Williamson, 1997b).

In the face of these pressures and the changing technological, social, economic and intellectual contexts, the severest criticism of the universities has been

> '...their failure to create their own vision of the future'

> (Tapper and Salter, 1992; 246).

Arguably, the alternative (postmodern) analysis would support the view that the higher education 'system' reflects a plurality of visions, institutional purposes, missions and identities (Smith and Webster, 1997).

The broader backdrop of this thesis is this continuing failure of the managing agencies of higher education, facilitated by the innate conservatism of the university sector, to respond to the compelling impetus to reform and the opportunities to influence the course of the future structure of higher education which have been presented by two major reviews in three decades, the Robbins Committee appointed in 1961 and reporting two years later, (3) and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education chaired by Sir Ron (now Lord) Dearing which reported in 1997. (4)

Structural developments within the sector designed to respond to some of these changes and intended to transform the model of higher education to meet the needs of wider constituencies and to de-construct the pattern of social exclusion, have been fiercely resisted by a group of institutions described, perhaps somewhat caricatured, as

> 'Selective in their intake of students, dominated by the logic of academic subjects, didactic teaching and independently developed research agendas.... aloof from the societies which supported them.... (whose) ....students....were typically young, enrolled on full-time courses and, for much of the twentieth century, predominantly male and middle class. Their social and cultural ambience was monastic; even the great Victorian civic institutions ran to an ecclesiastical calendar and their central rituals (gowns, Latin mottoes etc.) harked back to the medieval university.'

> (Coffield and Williamson, 1997b: 7).

The following analysis examines the nature of this resistance and its implications for the development of the structure of higher education. The issue of the University College title

and the changing perceptions of the status of University Colleges with which this thesis is centrally concerned encapsulates, in microcosm, the tensions of reputational status, both at institutional and sector level, which remain significant factors in the structural reform of higher education. The historical analysis of the development of the University Colleges which contextualises the thesis provides an essential backdrop to the debate which has intensified in the mid-1990s with regard to the legitimate use of the title.

Notes

1.   The DES produced a document entitled *'The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s* in which this view was prominent, commenting that:

> *'The economic performance of the United Kingdom since 1945 has been disappointing compared to the achievements of others. The Government believes that it is vital for our higher education to contribute more effectively to the improvement of the performance of the economy.'*

(DES, 1985: Para 1.2; 3).

Esland later maintained that:

> *'Although the political contexts are very different, the issues surrounding education, training and economic performance at the beginning of the 1990s are little changed from those which dominated the debates....when Jim Callaghan made his Ruskin College speech....in spite of the numerous initiatives designed to change the institutional structures of education in the UK, the problems which have beset British economic performance for much of the post-war period have proved to be.... intractable....and continue to pose major questions about the future preparation of the workforce.'*

(Esland, 1991: ix).

2.   In a series of public presentations Professor David Robertson has argued this case consistently. (Presentation to a Seminar on 'Key Issues in Management in Further and Higher Education' , Warrington Collegiate Institute 30 January 1998). On the issue of structural reform, he suggests that:

> *'The frustratingly conservative character of higher education, the fragmentation of the sector into a multiplicity of largely autonomous fiefdoms and the preference for self-referenced over public judgements of role and purpose leave universities poorly placed to....(fulfil)....a fundamental commitment to social justice....'*

(Robertson (1997b) in F. Coffield and B. Williamson [1997] *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham, Open University Press).

3.   *Report of the Committee on Higher Education* (The Robbins Report) (1963) Cmnd. 2154, London, HMSO).

4.   The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997) (The Dearing Inquiry). *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. London, HMSO.

CHAPTER 2

THE RESEARCH CONTEXT: QUESTIONS, APPROACHES AND ISSUES

2.1 Introduction

The exploration of the issues set out in the introduction requires detailed discussion of: (a) the nature of research design, namely the approaches adopted and the theoretical considerations involved; (b) an explanation of the focus of the inquiry, essentially the perspectives, questions and methodological tools which have determined the form and structure of the research; (c) the methodological problems inherent in the research design; (d) a statement of the structure of the thesis; (e) the originality of the thesis; (f) the parameters of the thesis; and (g) the significance of the thesis, that is, its contribution to scholarship.

2.2 The Nature of the Inquiry: theoretical approaches

It is in the process of questioning the claims of objectivity, explanation and understanding of scientific inquiry that the limitations on research methodologies have been subject to continuous philosophical debate for centuries. In educational research, issues relating to the nature of scientific inquiry have reflected different conceptions of social reality which have perpetuated the continuing and developing controversy surrounding the transposition of the aims of research, as defined in the natural sciences, to the social sciences context in an attempt to discover universal and immutable laws which regulate and determine individual and social behaviour. *Positivism* and *phenomenology* (1) generically describe

these competing traditions, or overarching perspectives. However, the representation of this distinction in a way which implies that the two approaches are incompatible or mutually exclusive (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) fails to recognise that methodology is often based on pragmatic rather than philosophical grounds where

> '....the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is really a technical matter....to do with their suitability in answering particular research questions'.
>
> (Bryman, 1988: 108-9).

In essence, no one set of research methods is intrinsically valid in and of itself, but rather acquires validity in its capacity to fulfil explicit research purposes in particular contexts (Henwood and Pidgeon, 1993).

A new orthodoxy for social science methodology has emerged which is pluralistic in its approach to methods and which supersedes (by encompassing) more traditional methodologies which have set interpretive and quantitative analysis as oppositional and mutually exclusive approaches.

Critical theory (2) is an important perspective in this context since its primary method is ideology critique, a defining feature of policy research and which therefore warrants consideration here. This view rejects the extreme technical specialisation and the exclusion of alternative research techniques characteristic of both positivist and naturalistic paradigms. The fact/value dichotomy, which many social scientists, from their respective positions, have considered incontrovertible, and the Weberian pursuit of 'value-free' social

11

science (3) which is its essential core, are regarded by critical theorists as epistemologically flawed.

Critical theory is represented by a questioning of the social practices and attitudes under investigation together with a continuous appraisal of the adequacy of the data and methods employed (Fay, 1975). The essence of critical theory is explicitly prescriptive and normative and its principal intention is transformative, seeking not merely to offer an account of social phenomena but to examine and interrogate the underlying legitimacy of the interests at work within them. It is argued that critical theorists, contrary to the traditional view of the aims of research, do not seek to achieve neutrality and objectivity but pursue a substantive and deliberate political agenda for change

> '....hold(ing) up to the lights of legitimacy and equality issues of repression, voice, ideology, power, participation, representation, inclusion, and interests....to bring about a more just, egalitarian society in which individual and collective freedoms are practised, and to eradicate the exercise and effects of illegitimate power'

> (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, forthcoming: 29)

Since many of the issues considered in this study of structural reform in higher education relate directly to legitimacy, institutional status, equality and inclusion, this explicit political agenda is evident in the work of numerous contemporary analysts (Coffield and Williamson, 1997; Trow, 1964; 1994; 1998; Scott, 1984;1995). Whilst the critique of critical theory continues to hold that the task of the researcher is to be dispassionate, disinterested and objective (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, forthcoming), in the development of the philosophy of research and its relationship to the social world, the

12

concept of theory as social intervention (Mills, 1970) is utilised to legitimise social transformation as an objective of research activity. From an explicitly Marxist perspective, Ozga and Gewirtz (1994) maintain that critical theory is not implicated in the solution of problems, and is able to

> '....draw attention to, and challenge, the assumptions informing policy and it can expose the effects of policy on the ground, in particular where policies increase inequality and impact unfairly on particular groups....set out to explain how injustices and inequalities are produced, reproduced and sustained....and provide a basis for the development of strategies of social transformation'.
>
> (Ozga and Gewirtz, 1994: 123).

In this approach the critical social scientist does not embrace value-freedom as a goal but maintains that description is choice in which merely selecting a subject for study involves a value judgement. A research methodology has thus developed based on 'conscious partiality' replacing spectator knowledge with active participation in social and political movements. (4) This thesis embodies the critical theory perspective in challenging the reputational status of higher education institutions which has provided the basis of the resistance to the structural reform of the sector and which has contributed substantially to the failure to transform the model of higher education to meet the needs of wider constituencies and to de-construct the pattern of social exclusion.

Whilst the research to that extent reflects the researcher's values, 'critical theorists' have taken the view that 'reflexivity' is the essential safeguard involving a continuous process of 'auto-critique', subjecting not only values but the whole research process to perpetual scrutiny, bringing into sharp relief the importance of issues relating to validity and

reliability in the context of policy research. The issue of 'reflexivity' is considered in greater detail below (pp. 26-27).

2.3   The Focus of the Inquiry: perspectives, questions and methodological tools

This research has as its principal focus of inquiry the nature of structural reform in British (more specifically, English) higher education.   In particular, it attempts to investigate, from a range of different perspectives, the historical development, current role and future status of the University College sector.   The existence and development of University Colleges in their modern guise raises a series of questions from a range of different perspectives: i) at a *global* level in the wider system of higher education, there are questions regarding institutional and sector development, particularly, the relationship between the historical development of former University Colleges and their current nature, form and role; ii) at *sector* level, relating to such issues as sectoral diversity and the future pattern and shape of higher education provision across the system where many different models of inter-institutional collaboration exist, providing, it is suggested, differing degrees of legitimacy to the use of the university college title; and iii) at *institutional* level where considerations of institutional status and sector and market position are deemed to be significant.

This research has three interrelated dimensions designed to examine each of these different perspectives which may be categorised as historical, sectoral, and institutional. Each dimension is guided by a distinctive set of research questions and each demands a different approach and a range of tools of inquiry which offer a series of methodological issues and

problems.   The diversity of methodological approach reflects the complexity of the

research problem which requires a multi-dimensional perspective, involving a range of

techniques and requiring the researcher to adopt a variety of roles: historian;   policy

analyst;   interviewer;   and participant observer.   The following section identifies each

dimension of the research; the research questions it seeks to address; and the central

methodological, practical and ethical issues which are raised in these different approaches

and roles.

2.3.1   The Historical Dimension

The historical dimension of the investigation seeks to trace the development of university

colleges within the wider context of the growth of higher education provision, highlighting

the extent to which the context in which many of these institutions were established and

prospered was a determinant of their success.   This aspect of the research is designed to

examine the growing political, economic and social pressures as primary motivating factors

in the development of the 'system' of higher education and focuses on the nature of

individual institutional development in response to the burgeoning demand for the

expansion of educational opportunity.   This enables a comparative analysis to be

undertaken of the contemporary approach to institutional development and aspiration

illustrated in the outcomes of two major committees of inquiry into higher education

which, within the last three decades, have sought to respond to the pressure to adapt the

structure of higher education to accommodate the change from an elite to a mass system.

The research depends, therefore, in its initial stages upon both historical and policy analysis and seeks to assess the extent to which, in pronouncing on the future of the University College sector in their respective Reports, the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education failed to recognise (and perhaps, in the latter case, attempted to disregard) the historical significance of University College title and status in the development of many of the (now) most prestigious universities in the sector. This approach addresses a number of key research questions, specifically the extent to which:

- *longevity and tradition, as the basis of the reputational status of the university sector, is a myth or a reality;*

- *the historical development of the university sector reflects the structured, planned and rational formation and development of a university 'system' or the piecemeal, unsystematic growth of individual institutions;*

- *institutional and community aspiration, political, social, educational and cultural pressures, individual influence and financial constraints have been significant features in the historical development of the university sector;*

- *the historical perspective informed the judgements of the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and how far political and status considerations have influenced their respective reports;*

- *the recommendations of the committees of inquiry have responded to the pressures to expand the higher education system and to extend educational opportunity to previously under-represented groups.*

It is evident that while historical research and policy analysis cannot meet many of the criteria which constitute the scientific method in its definition in the natural sciences since it cannot depend upon direct observation or experimentation, it meets the conditions of legitimate scientific endeavour in subscribing to the principles and general requirements of

investigative rigour and scholarship applying to all scientific research (Mouly 1978). The value of this approach to research is summarised in its capacity to utilise '.....*the past to predict the future and to use the present to explain the past*' (Hill and Kerber, in Cohen and Manion, 1994: 45).

In this particular study, the historical and political contexts, and the social and educational pressure for expansion of the sector which has fuelled the development of university colleges, are contrasted with the contemporary climate in which, in some cases, although responding to similar, indeed, more intense pressure to expand, the view of their role and legitimacy as an integral part of the higher education sector has been challenged.

The historical analysis has fundamental contemporary relevance in the interpretation of the work of the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and for the central thesis, since the concept of institutional and sector status which, it will be demonstrated, has been so prominent in the approaches and outcomes of these two committees, has its origins and derives its current validity from the (mis-) perceived historical positioning and reputational status of the university sector. The historical perspective is essential to this understanding.

Historical investigation involves: the identification and delineation of a research problem or an area of study; the formulation of a set of questions or hypotheses; the collection, organisation, verification, validation, analysis and selection of data; the testing of the hypotheses and the presentation of evidence within an interpretive framework (Borg and

Gall, 1989; Cohen and Manion, 1994). This perspective shares a number of characteristics with other qualitative research methodologies *viz.*: emphasis on the study of context; the study of behaviour in natural (rather than laboratory) settings; appreciation of the wholeness of experience; and, crucially, the centrality of interpretation (Edson, 1986). The issue of interpretation is most significant since, by its nature, historical research is dependent on the prior collection of evidence and the recording of events by, for example, a biographer, journalist, historian, or diarist. In all instances the compilation of an historical source involves an interpretive act which is necessarily subjective, reflecting the values, interests, judgements and priorities and in some cases, the bias of the compiler.

The outcome of historical analysis is a 'constructed reality' (Burstyn, 1987) which has led contemporary historians to dismiss the nineteenth century view of history which emphasised objectivity and the compilation of irrefutable evidence (Carr, 1967), and to adopt an approach which subordinates historical 'facts' to an interpretative framework to provide meaning and significance (Borg and Gall, 1989). A continuing awareness of this constructed reality is an essential moderating influence in historical research. The researcher adds a further, personal layer of interpretation upon the selected evidence and, in *discovering* rather than *creating* data, establishes categories and patterns of meaning which are removed from the actual events.

In view of the emphasis upon documentary evidence and secondary sources, the question of interpretation has represented a continuing concern throughout the historical and policy analysis aspects of this study. Particularly significant in this regard is the notion that

18

interpretation extends beyond the issue of selection and involves consideration of the implications of utilising documentary evidence for purposes other than that for which it was intended or, inadvertent sources (Bell, 1987). To an extent this diminishes the tendency to accept others' constructed reality and provides a counterbalance to the bias inherent in some historical sources considered below.

The nature of the documentary evidence is important. Literature on the classification of documents falls into three main groups: first, primary, secondary and tertiary documents; second, public and private documents; and third, solicited and unsolicited documents (Denzin, 1978). The historical aspect of this study has drawn predominantly upon primary and secondary sources, both public and private, and unsolicited documents (in the sense of not being specifically prepared for later research purposes). These have been utilised in conjunction with policy analysis to construct a general view of the political and educational context of sector development. In view of the aims of this research, the use of primary sources was necessarily limited since it does not set out to provide a new perspective on the history of individual institutions, but rather seeks to examine the environment in which the sector as a whole developed. Whilst this avoided many of the methodological issues relating to the use of primary source material such as the problems of verification of genuineness, variant sources, attribution of authorship, and the validation of the context in which the source has been produced, (5) it is clear that the secondary sources, institutional histories and biographies of leading figures in universities' histories (often compiled by senior staff in the self-same universities) are often romanticised views of the origins and growth of a particular institution (6) which, equally frequently (particularly in biography

form) over-emphasise the influence and impact of a single individual. (7) In the light of this, the use of documentary evidence, particularly these types of secondary sources which are often designed to glorify institutions and individuals, although offering valuable insight, often as 'unwitting' evidence (Marwick, 1977), moderates their validity as a reliable evidential base. As Borg and Gall maintain,

> *'People often exaggerate their own roles in important affairs*
> *....(This)....may not be deliberate, but merely reflects the occurrences*
> *from their point of view....a discrepancy between someone's public*
> *and private statements....does not necessarily mean that they have no*
> *value as historical evidence'*
>
> (Borg and Gall,1989: 821).

These concerns, however, serve further to reinforce the ultimate value of historical study being determined largely by the researcher's ability to evaluate the value and significance of the evidence presented. This awareness of the methodological issues involved in the use of biographies, institutional histories, policy documents and statistical evidence which have been central to the historical and policy analysis elements of this study, has continuously informed the examination of its evidential base.

2.3.2 The Sectoral Dimension

The sectoral perspective of the research seeks to construct a 'map' of the University Colleges sector as an aspect of the wider higher education system. As the centralised control of higher education has increased through more extensive planning of its funding and structure, and the level of research into its operational performance intensified, the information available from government departments, national agencies and funding councils in the form of statistical data describing individual and groups of institutions,

20

league tables of performance, published information for the benefit of educational 'consumers', and the minute dissection of detailed aspects of income and expenditure by, for example teaching and research or commercial activity, has proliferated. Despite the changes in the structure of higher education during the last decade, with the ending of the binary divide which brought university status to the former polytechnics, the university sector itself has remained clearly defined. (8) However, the increase in the number of institutions assuming the title University College in recent years, comprising a widely divergent group of institutions with different origins, organisational missions, markets, reputations and aspirations, leaves this sector less clearly defined. In the context of a study which sets out to examine the current position and future role of these institutions, and to analyse the way in which these institutions have been regarded, it is essential that the 'sector', the number and types of institutions and the range of educational provision which they encompass, often spanning further and higher education provision, is, as far as possible, clearly delineated. This dimension of the research seeks to identify the nature of these institutions, categorise them as providers of higher education, and to examine the rationale for their existence independent of, but inextricably linked to the mainstream university sector. This analysis confirms the existing confusion of institutional status and the anomalies of institutional positioning, reflecting both the elite values of the sector and the legacy of its piecemeal and unstructured historical development.

This aspect of the research design is intended to address a number of specific research questions related to other aspects of the study, specifically, the extent to which:

- *it is possible to construct a single 'map' of the university colleges;*

- *there are clear, widely agreed criteria to define the inclusion of certain types of institutions within the group;*

- *other factors such as political and status considerations have determined the manner in which the criteria have been established and implemented;*

- *the 'map' of the university colleges is confused by inconsistent terminology and the complexity of inter-institutional relationships;*

- *the work of the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education has been informed by a clear and consistent understanding of the complex composition of the sector and the extent to which the validity of the recommendations emanating from the two committees relating to the future of university colleges is dependent upon, or affected by, their respective understanding of the composition of the higher education sector.*

The attempt to 'map' the University College sector is based on statistical and documentary evidence drawn from published (mainly government) sources detailing size, sources of funding, range of course provision, student populations by mode and level of study and a range of other indices which locate the university colleges within the spectrum of higher education providers. This analysis, original in its focus, examines the inconsistencies and anomalies which permeate the funding and structural arrangements, and the confusions and misperceptions of status and role which apply to this group of institutions.

This mode of analysis has been dependent to a significant degree upon official statistics and other information as a research source. It is important to recognise that, given the highly sensitive politics of expansion and funding of higher education in recent years, these data do not simply represent descriptions of the sector to be accepted uncritically, but

rather should be viewed as social and political constructs based on the need to demonstrate the efficacy of past and current government policy for higher education. (9) Facts rarely speak for themselves and the political significance of information from official sources, particularly to the extent that such data may vindicate current government policy or confirm the failures of past governments, demonstrate the significance of *interpretation* and *discretion* (May, 1993) through numerous filters, and the political 'spin' which accompanies the publication of higher education statistics.

2.3.3 The Institutional Dimension

The third dimension of the research is represented by a case study of a single institution, the researcher's own place of work, which is centrally affected by the proposed changes to name, title and possibly status, consequent upon the implementation of the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the passage of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998.

This case study seeks to address number of research questions, specifically, the extent to which:

- *parallels exist between the history and development, institutional profile, relationships with its parent university, and the political campaign mounted by Warrington Collegiate Institute and these factors as they applied to the range of institutions considered in Chapter 3 of the thesis and the substantial historical precedent which they established;*

- *current policy initiatives reflect the parallels and differences in historical development between University College Warrington and its precursors bearing the title;*

- *the criteria recommended by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act*

1998 as they relate to institutional title have presented a policy conflict when viewed against the correspondence between the organisational mission and the commitment of the Government to widening participation and extending access to educational opportunity.

The case study as a research tool does not refer to a single, standard methodological approach, nor to a particular range of investigative tools or roles such as observational studies, but is eclectic in its procedures and traditions incorporating observation, interview, and audio-visual recording (Cohen and Manion, 1994). The case study approach is particularly valuable in this context, a complex multi-layered issue, precisely because it enables a range of investigative techniques to be utilised to respond to different sets of research questions relating to institutional policy and its implementation, the context of formal and informal debate, and individual, key-player, responses to the issue of University College title.

The central methodological concern in the use of case study is regarded as its generalisability, or the relationship of the instance studied to the class from which it is drawn. Adelman *et. al.* (1984) identify three types of generalisations which may be drawn from case studies: i) from the instance studied to the class it purports to represent; ii) from case-bound features of the instance to the multiplicity of classes; and iii) generalisations about the case (in those studies which do not assert the instance-class relationship). The use of the case study in this research conforms to the third type, since the distinctiveness of the historical development, organisational mission and aspiration of individual university colleges arguably determines their highly individualistic responses to

the developments under consideration here. Such responses are not strictly generalisable across the sector and, indeed, the differentiation in perceived impact of the changes to title and status is an important theme, reflecting the complexity of the issue. The use of the case study in this instance relates, therefore, not to its representational value but as a means of analysing the institutional responses to the issues and tensions generated by the impact of policy in practice.

Participant observation within case studies has been criticised as subjective, biased, impressionistic, idiosyncratic and lacking in the precise quantifiable measures characteristic of, for example, survey and experimentation (Stake, 1978). However, the value of qualitative research methods such as ethnographic studies and the use of participant observation has strengthened the justification for the case study as a legitimate and fruitful research method, particularly as one of a range of different perspectives on a research problem.

This case study analysis is dependent upon observational techniques which range along two axes in a typology of observation studies (Bailey, 1978) from structured to unstructured and natural to artificial, and is based upon the analysis of extensive data, comprising correspondence and internal documents on the issue, and notes and observations of the meetings in which the researcher was directly involved. In this instance the participant observer role, a term developed by cultural anthropologists gathering evidence and insight from the close professional involvement with the research

subjects (Denzin, 1970), was particularly appropriate on the issue of University College title since the researcher is employed as Dean of University College, Warrington.

This particular form of investigation was appropriate to the research topic, affording considerable advantages in direct access to information and individual policy makers in the organisation, active involvement in a range of decision-making forums within the institution, for example the Senior Management Team, continuing involvement in the consultation on the institutional responses and initiatives as events unfolded, and the mutually reinforcing relationship between the research endeavour and the professional responsibility of the researcher as a senior manager within the organisation.

In view of the importance of the concept of reflexivity, the continuous examination of the researcher's role, it is important to note that the author, as well as researcher, was an involved, knowledgeable participant in the case study as the political implications of the issue of the University College title unfolded following the publication of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the introduction of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998. Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) emphasise the reflexive nature of social research recognising that researchers are inextricably bound up in the research context and that '...*this is not a matter of methodological commitment, it is an existential fact.*' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1983: 14-15). This makes implausible the attempts to base social research upon 'common-sense knowledge' and the search for absolutist positions and clear truths. Whilst a defensible argument, it does not absolve the researcher of the responsibility to strive for validated evidence, but rather reinforces the

need for reflexivity, adapting research strategies to ensure that the development and testing of theory remains the distinctive function of social theory. The researcher in this study by virtue of the participant observer role and as a significant, knowledgeable and interested party has been continuously aware of the extent to which context of discovery has the potential to frame the parameters of the hypotheses within the study. Well-founded intuition is insufficient validation and the research context can provide a straitjacket of beliefs (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983). The range of research methods adopted and the nature of the multiple sources of validity used (particularly respondent and jury validity) has ensured that the value and significance of the political and policy context which is vital to the study and the ethnographic evidence which relies on key participants' views of the issues raised expressed in their own categories, taxonomies and vocabularies (including those of the researcher), has been balanced with a substantial historical and policy-analysis context which, of themselves, have contributed substantially to the formulation and exposition of the central thesis.

2.4   Issues of Methodology

This multi-faceted approach to the study provides the opportunity to cast light upon the research problem from a number of different angles, each illuminating distinct but interrelated aspects of the issue of the role of university colleges in the higher education sector. Consequently, the historical review and policy analysis, the 'mapping' of the sector, and the case study focusing on a single institution, provide triangulated evidence which maintains concurrent validity and reliability. Whilst each approach offers valuable insights, the range of methods adopted has generated a series of issues and concerns (often

specific to a particular method) central to the conduct of social investigation, particularly the ethics of research and the nature of validity and reliability in this context.

2.4.1 Ethics

The concept of the purpose of social science as contributing knowledge to improve the human condition and enhance human dignity affords research the status of a moral enterprise and, as such, is governed by certain imperatives and ethical codes.

Essentially the codes of research practice formulated by various agencies and professional bodies, (10) providing guidance rather than prescription, are designed to assist in the management of the complex and subtle concerns which arise in maintaining a balance between researchers' obligations as professional scientists in pursuit of truth, and their subjects' rights and values which are potentially threatened by the research act. The fundamental ethical dilemma is described thus:

> '....the right to research and acquire knowledge and the right of individual research participants to self-determination, privacy and dignity. A decision not to conduct a planned research project because it interferes with the participants' welfare is a limit on the first of these rights. A decision to conduct research despite an ethically questionable practice....is a limit on the second right'

> (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias in Cohen and Manion 1994: 350).

Ethical issues may stem both from the kinds of problems investigated by social scientists and the methods used to obtain valid and reliable data. In theory, at least, this means that each stage in the research sequence may be a potential source of ethical problems arising

28

from: the nature of the project itself; the context of the research; the procedures to be adopted; the methods of data collection; the nature of the research subjects; the nature of the data collected; and the use of the research findings.

Ethical dilemmas, pervade the entire research process, raising issues regarding: the responsibilities to colleagues and the profession; the relationship with research participants; and the researcher's responsibilities to research participants.

The responsibilities to colleagues and the profession are fundamental but relatively simply expressed. This researcher, as a senior manager in higher education, has been aware throughout the study (particularly in those aspects which have involved interviewing of principals and chief executives in other organisations) of the extent to which the relationships formed, professional integrity, trust, competence, conduct and outcomes affect the way in which future researchers will be received. Despite the fact that replication studies are rare in social sciences, the issue of 'spoiling the field' by infringing these general principles has been an important consideration.

The relationship with research participants was a key factor since this generates potentially significant ethical issues. The access to participants was carefully negotiated, although, given the nature of the subjects, issues of coercion were not relevant. Aspects of the concept of informed consent (Diener and Crandall, 1978) were considered. Voluntarism, involved the provision of full information about the nature and purposes of the research and the establishment of a clear understanding of its implications were imparted (both

orally and in writing) in advance of the subjects' agreement to participate. There were no circumstances in this research context which justified or necessitated infringing the principle of informed consent. It is important to note that strict adherence to this principle affected the reporting of the research findings, particularly in the case study where respondent validation significantly steered the case study at times. Similarly, the serious ethical dangers inherent in the use of covert methods which may violate the principle of informed consent or invade the privacy of the research participants, or the use of deception, either by withholding from the participant the true nature of the research, or actively misleading to conceal the true purposes of the study did not apply. (11) The study was founded upon full disclosure of the aims, purposes and methods to all participants, however problematic, for example, in preventing the full reporting of the case study

The responsibilities to participants in maintaining respect for their physical, social and psychological (12) well-being were not particularly significant in this study, although the professional and reputational standing of research participants, particularly in the context of the research interviews and the disclosures within the case study, clearly affected the manner of the reporting of the research outcomes. Issues of consideration and respect relating to adequate de-briefing and the provision of statements of research findings were recognised and addressed. Assurances that the published research findings as they related to a particular institution, or to statements made by and attributed to an individual respondent, would be referred to the respondent prior to publication, were met.

Concerns surrounding the concepts of privacy, anonymity and confidentiality were important and, at times, difficult, particularly since the adoption of a qualitative approach to the research and the use of semi-structured interviews (Appendix 2) was intended specifically to respect research participants as subjects of the study rather than as research objects (i.e. addressing a criticism of the positivist, predominantly quantitative, approach). Clearly, the disclosure of the interview schedule identifies the interviewees and the institutions which they represent and, to that extent, confronts the principles of anonymity and confidentiality. This was particularly significant since guarantees of confidentiality were given at the outset in writing and prior to the commencement of each interview and this, combined with the preferential access based on mutual professional trust, enabled numerous subjects to comment on colleagues' actions or those of other institutions or agencies in the sector in highly unflattering terms. However, the disclosure of the identities of the research participants is essential to support the research findings since the *jury validity* and *construct validity* which is sought through the interview process is dependent upon evidence, by virtue of their office, of the interviewees' expertise in the research field, verification of their role as opinion-formers, and the significance of their views on the policy implications under consideration.

The issues of privacy, anonymity and confidentiality, necessitated a judgement as to the extent to which the respondents' beliefs, forms of expression and, particularly, actions should be disclosed. The primary concern here was 'non-maleficence', to ensure that the form of disclosure of the views expressed did not harm the research participants nor invite politically, professionally or personally damaging consequences. Since the respondents,

as heads of higher education institutions, were well known to each other, and to the wider sector, the problems of confidentiality and anonymity were exacerbated since the study could not rely on, for example, the devices available to de-personalise the outcomes of a mass questionnaire to prevent the identification of individual respondents. It was necessary in these circumstances for the researcher to interpret the interview, to de-personalise the comments but to retain the essence of the information, views and arguments in providing the basis of informed consent. In all instances, therefore, particularly in the case study where the researcher was engaged in continuing discussions on the issue of University College title, it was necessary to ensure that where the views expressed had not been previously, or were not currently, publicly associated with the formal position of the individual or institution, or where those views in some way disparaged other individuals or institutions involved in the debate, that these views were anonymised or aggregated in such a way as to represent abstracted issues of conflicting view rather than personal criticism of individuals or sector agencies, or that informed consent for the release of such data was obtained. The converse concern was to ensure that the 'beneficence' issue, the perceived benefits of the research to the participants, was taken fully into account in order to avoid questions of collusion between the researcher and the research participants. In fact, the research was conducted at a time when the sector was generally confused with regard to the implications of the Dearing Inquiry and the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998. Individual institutions were in the process of establishing different policy positions and it would therefore have been impossible to identify a single outcome which would have been of benefit to all participants. Even the issue of recognition as university colleges of some categories of institutions was a matter of serious dispute and the confusions arising from

the lack of clear definitional criteria in Chapter 4 demonstrate the unlikely prospect of finding a position on the issue to which all parties could subscribe, less still manipulate the research outcomes to achieve an outcome which could benefit all concerned.

In the context of the earlier reference to the sensitivities regarding 'spoiling the field' this approach ensured that future researchers' access to these research subjects was not damaged by the indiscretions of a previous researcher, offered privileged access precisely on the basis of professional trust, and subsequently breaching the agreement upon which access to the research subjects was based.

A related issue was that of betrayal, a term normally applied in this context to the public disclosure of data revealed in confidence in such a way as to cause embarrassment, anxiety, or perhaps suffering. Finch (1993) refers to the view of the powerful being regarded as 'fair game' for the researcher. In the context of this study it was important to record and analyse the views expressed to the extent that they contributed to the global understanding of the issue and to avoid the vilification of particular individuals or organisations whose views conflicted with those of the researcher, particularly where those views may have influenced public policy on this issue.

Finally, important ethical considerations affect the publication of research findings particularly in this context in view of the role of the researcher. Issues relating to the independence of the inquiry and its outcomes are significant and the management of conflicting roles represents a potentially serious ethical problem. Punch (1986)

highlighted the problems of role conflict and political and financial pressures which may threaten the independence of the researcher by encouraging the interpretation of the views expressed as those of the sponsor (in this case the employer) rather than as the valid, reliable outcomes of the research. In this case the researcher is employed by an organisation with clear, publicly stated, views on the issue of the current status and future role of university colleges which compounds the potential to compromise the integrity of the research findings. This issue was addressed by establishing agreement regarding the nature of the participant observation undertaken by the researcher during the gathering of evidence, and providing a copy of the final draft of the case study to the Principal and Chief Executive of Warrington Collegiate Institute for clearance and respondent validation prior to its publication. It is significant that the final version of the case study as it appears in this thesis is less pointed in many of its observations and conclusions and less revealing in its evidential base precisely because the duty of the researcher to the Principal and Chief Executive of Warrington Collegiate Institute, in accordance with the principle of informed consent, required the witholding of certain data and evidence. This reflects the conflict between the responsibility of the researcher for the publication of full and accurate information which is pertinent to the debate and the individual's right to privacy, since the case study, in part, inevitably identified individuals, their views and courses of action which, it was deemed should remain confidential. The issue of the researcher's access to privileged information by virtue of his professional role within an organisation became a matter of considerable importance in the negotiation of the final version of the case study. In view of the sensitivity and importance of these professional relationships to all parties, the integrity of the research findings and, consequently, the concepts of validity and

34

reliability, remained significant and these form the final set of issues to be considered in the context of this study.

In attempting to reconceptualise and demystify these central methodological issues, Kvale argues that

> *'In modern social science the(se) concepts....have reached the status of a scientific holy trinity. They appear to belong to some abstract realm in a sanctuary of science so far removed from the interactions of the everyday world, and to be worshipped with respect by all true believers in science'*

(Kvale, 1996: 229).

It is necessary to recognise that issues of validity and reliability have particular meaning and significance and therefore may be interpreted differently in the contexts of quantitative and qualitative research.

2.4.2 Validity

In quantitative research validity refers to the degree to which scientific observations actually measure or record what they purport to measure. Establishing validity requires determining the extent to which conclusions effectively represent empirical reality and assessing whether constructs devised by the researchers represent or measure the categories of human experience that occur (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984).

Although described as the touchstone of all types of research, it is evident that the definition and understanding of the nature of validity has changed and developed and equally clear that validity has more recently been regarded as a relative rather than an

absolute position, in which complete validity is an ideal, unattainable state (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, forthcoming). In identifying a series of different expressions, or forms of validity, (13) these authors maintain that it is important for validity to be located within the research paradigm - whether this be positivist or naturalistic - though not paradigm-bound.

In quantitative and qualitative analysis validity comprises a range of sub-elements (Cohen and Manion, 1994) such as: *face validity*, which seeks to establish whether the questions are measuring what they are intended to measure; *bias*, which relates to the quality of the formulation of the research questions or the selection of research subjects; *convergent validity*, where data comparisons are made across studies utilising the same method; *internal validity* which focuses on whether the results are genuine for the group studied, that is whether the explanation of a particular research phenomenon is sustained by the data provided. This is based on the confidence in, and authenticity of the data, its cogency, dependability and confirmability (LeCompte and Preissle, 1993: 323-4).

The concept of *external validity* refers to the degree to which research results may be generalized to the wider population. Campbell and Stanley, writing about experimental methods, established the basis of the view of generalisability thus

> *'External validity asks the question of generalisability: To what populations, settings, treatment variables and measurement variables can the effect be generalised?'*
>
> (Campbell and Stanley, 1963: 175).

The capacity to generalize to and across populations, to generalize findings to diverse populations and times has been a primary goal of science (Smith, 1975). Many authors

(Guba and Lincoln, 1982; Patton, 1990; Schofield, 1993; LeCompte and Preissle, 1993) have contributed to the understanding of this concept particularly in the context of qualitative analysis, leading to a reconceptualisation of the 'classical' view of Campbell and Stanley. Again, based on the positivist stance in which the aim of social science is to produce laws of human behaviour, it is clear that the sampling from a population of sites in order to generalize to the larger population is clearly unworkable for qualitative researchers in general (Schofield, 1993) and in the context of this particular research.

Guba and Lincoln (1982) sought to replace the concept of generalisability with that of 'fittingness' with its emphasis on the matching of one situation with another, and Goetz and LeCompte (1984) preferred comparability and transferability. Schofield (1993) maintains that many qualitative researchers are interested in theory and illumination rather than empirical generalisability. This is an important issue since, it is argued, whilst the positivist approach requires the isolation, control and the systematic sampling of variables, this removal of contextual distinctiveness in the examination of the complex, irreducible, socially situated and unique research situation which positivists regard as essential to the generalisability of the findings, for ethnographers significantly diminishes the value of the research (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *op.cit.*). In this research, particularly with reference to the case study, the concept of generalisability, or external validity, is less meaningful than the concept of illumination (Schofield 1993).

A central issue in this study concerns the generalisability of qualitative findings from the case study method. Stake (1994) identified three forms of generalization from case

studies - naturalistic, resting on personal experience and deriving from tacit knowledge; statistical, which is formal and explicit where the outcomes of selected subjects and the quantification of findings may be amenable to statistical generalization; and analytical, generalization which involves a reasoned judgement based on logical analysis regarding the extent to which the findings from one study may be used as guide to another situation. To reaffirm the previous discussion (p. 25), the role of the case study in this research is to emphasise the distinctiveness and highly individualistic responses to the developments under consideration here and its value rests, therefore, not in its representational nature but as a means of analysing the institutional responses to the issues and tensions generated by the impact of policy in practice.

Kennedy (1979) emphasises the importance of rules of inference based on the comparison of relevant attributes and rich descriptions of data which may facilitate the search for differences and similarities in other contexts. The essential value of case studies remains the provision of a range of contexts which may be interpreted to expand and enrich the repertoire of social constructions available to other researchers (Donmoyer, 1990).

More generally, in qualitative analysis Maxwell (1992) regards the concept of validity as based less on research design and data but on the accounts provided by researchers and the uses made of such accounts. In this sense, the positivist notions of validity are superseded by the concept of authenticity in which the important considerations are: *descriptive validity*, whether the reporting of evidence is accurate; *interpretive validity*, which reflects the appropriateness of the concepts utilised; and *theoretical validity*, which is established

by reference to the degree of consensus in the research community regarding the suitability of the conceptual framework in which the research is conducted; *generalisability*, as previously considered; and *evaluative validity*, which applies an evaluative judgement of the research subject rather than adopting a descriptive, explanatory or interpretive framework (an approach which is clearly important to critical-theoretical perspectives). Both internal validity and descriptive validity in this research are achieved by the referring of the research findings to the respondents and participants. Theoretical validity has been secured by the examination of the substantial literature in the field of higher education and evaluative validity, like construct validity which is considered below (pp.40-41), has been achieved through a process of expert validation by specialist practitioners in the form of college principals.

It is clear that in qualitative research, for some authors, validity attaches to accounts, not to data or methods (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983) and that validity in qualitative research replaces certainty with confidence in our results, since accounts represent rather than reproduce reality (Hammersley 1992). Views of positivistic science are based on a modernist understanding of truth and validity, in which knowledge is defined as a reflection of reality. It is argued that, in the postmodern era, the absolutist foundations of truth and knowledge have dissolved and

> *'The conception of knowledge as a mirror of reality is replaced by knowledge as a social construction of reality....the issue of what is valid knowledge involves the philosophical question of what is truth....based on correspondence, coherence and pragmatic utility.'*
>
> (Kvale, 1996: 238-9).

Based on this postmodernist critique, Kvale introduces the concept of validity as 'quality of craftsmanship' and adapts the Popperian notions of verifiability and falsifiability in which the stronger the attempts to falsify a proposition, the more valid and trustworthy the knowledge. In this approach the validation of the findings depends on the quality of the investigation, the checking, questioning and the theoretical interpretation of the findings. Although these factors do not diminish the importance of precise observation and rigorous research techniques, the concept of validity as quality of process extends its meaning to include communication and the pragmatic effects of knowledge claims. In the positivist tradition these conversational and pragmatic aspects of knowledge have been regarded as irrelevant or secondary to objective and repeatable observation. In this view, however,

> '....the very conversation about, and the application of, knowledge become essential aspects of the construction of the social world. Ideally the quality of the craftsmanship results in products with knowledge claims that are so powerful and convincing in their own right that they....carry the validation with them....'

(Kvale, 1996: 252).

This research has taken account of a number of significant formulations of the concept of validity to reflect different aspects of the study in particular, *construct, jury, content and concurrent* validity. (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *op.cit.*)

Construct validity requires assurances that the *construction* of the research issue, that is: the concept of status as it applies to the higher education sector and, particularly, university colleges; the nature of the impact of recent changes both in the external policy environment and in internal organisation; and the definition of the nature, form, development, role and current sectoral position of institutions signified as university colleges, is consistent with

40

other constructions of the same set of issues and is defined according to similar principles. This is achieved at one level by virtue of being rooted in the literature which contributes to an established meaning of a particular construct, and is verified by the exploration of the nature of the construct by means of expert validations through the process of semi-structured interviews with a series of College Principals (Appendix 2), providing *jury validity*.

Content validity which is based upon the demonstration of the fair and comprehensive coverage of the research domain is established in this study by means of the exploration of a set of issues in depth and in breadth (reaffirming the importance of the multi-dimensional approach) to ensure the research constitutes a reasonable representation of the wider issues and appropriate weight is attached to each element.

Concurrent validity is achieved by means of the use of several lenses (methods) to view a particular phenomenon, namely, the significance of status in the structural reform of higher education, and in which the data gathered from one instrument is correlated with data gathered from others. In this study the multi-dimensional approach involving documentary analysis, interview, and participant observation has been utilised to establish whether a consonance is evident from the outcomes of these various instruments. This multi-method approach is significant in that it provides an important link with the concept of reliability, expressed through the notion of triangulation.

2.4.3 Reliability

Essentially, reliability in quantitative methods relates to the degree of consistency and replicability over time, over instruments and over groups of respondents and is based upon stability over time, equivalence in the forms of data-gathering instruments, and internal consistency (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *op. cit.*).

Reliability in quantitative research reflects the level of internal consistency or stability of the measuring device over time through a range of reliability coefficients (14) and is assessed through the rigour and suitability of the research design and the clear consistent application of statistical methods, seeking to establish:

> '.....the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions.'
>
> (Hammersley, 1992: 67)

Many subtle influences may diminish the reliability of research results: the impact of the researcher on the setting (the so-called Hawthorne effect); the values of the researcher constituting bias; the presence of 'demand characteristics' (Orne, 1962) in which the subjects anticipate the outcomes of the research and moderate their responses accordingly; and the lack of triangulation to corroborate different data sets (an issue which is considered later).

In qualitative research some authors have argued that reliability is not an issue for social scientists since '....the concept of replication itself is problematic' (Marshall and Rossman, 1989: 147). Significantly, Maxwell (1992) recognised the uniqueness of the research

situation and the extent to which researchers construct, rather than simply report, data. In this formulation, reliability is regarded not as a separate category of data testing but as a threat to validity, for example where two researchers give different accounts of the same situation, one challenging the descriptive validity of the other. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) maintained that the notion of replication as applied to quantitative research may not translate into qualitative research. Indeed, a characteristic strength of naturalistic studies, the uniqueness and the diverse, contextual richness of the research situation, is specifically denied by the requirement for technical replicability as defined in quantitative research. Nonetheless, other methods of achieving replication have been proposed in qualitative research based on the status position of the researcher, the choice of respondents, the social situation, analytic constructs, and methods of data collection (LeCompte and Preissle 1993), or through the stability of observations (over time and place), parallel forms, and inter-rater reliability (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). The application of the canons of reliability of quantitative research to qualitative research remains a contentious issue and it is suggested that the notion of reliability is most valuably expressed through an eclectic use of research instruments, researchers, perspectives and interpretations (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *op.cit.*). This confirms the significance of triangulation as an aspect of reliability in the research process.

2.4.4 Triangulation

Triangulation, based on a multi-dimensional approach to a research problem involves the use of two or more methods of data collection, both quantitative and qualitative in order to capture the complexity of human and social behaviour. This approach, as distinct from the

single-method approach which has typically characterised research in the physical sciences, acknowledges that research methods represent the selective experience and methodological preferences of the researcher(s) and act as filters through which a research problem is constructed and examined (Smith,1975). A multi-dimensional approach reduces this tendency to 'method-boundedness' (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *op.cit.*) and contributes an important element to the typology of triangulation established by Denzin (1970) which, in addition to methodological triangulation, included time, space and investigator triangulation. This was achieved in this study by a combination of research methods which included historical and policy analysis, interviews, and a case study which, whilst exploring different aspects of the issue of University College title, also afforded the opportunity to cross-refer tentative research outcomes and reflected the complexity of the research problem.

2.4.5   The Semi-Structured Interview

An important focal point of issues of validity and reliability within this research is the interview as a research tool. The semi-structured interviews with a number of College Principals and other senior staff from within the University College sector conducted as part of this investigation were designed, as previously discussed, to establish *jury validity* and *construct validity* and to optimise the *reliability* of the research findings in contributing to methodological triangulation. The schedule of interviews was established following the production of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Green Paper 'The Learning Age' (February 1998) but prior to the publication of the Teaching and Higher Education Bill (July 1998) to allow sufficient opportunity for the

44

individuals and the institutions concerned to have digested the Report and considered its implications specifically in relation to the issue of institutional title and status. There are numerous theoretical, methodological, practical and ethical issues arising from the interview as a research instrument which impact on the validity and reliability of the research findings. These issues are considered in greater detail in Appendix 2.

This study has, therefore, adopted a multi-method approach, utilising documentary and policy analysis, interview, and case study method involving participant observation within a single institution, and has drawn from statistical evidence relating to the institutional case study constructed specifically to inform the research from a range of different perspectives in order to attempt to optimise the validity and reliability of the study.

2.5   The Structure and Argument of the Thesis

The central thesis maintains that the existing structure and pattern of institutional providers of higher education and the basis on which it has developed, has progressively failed to resolve the tension between the increasing educational, social, political and cultural demands to widen access and extend educational opportunity, and the conflicting pressure to preserve the existing framework of institutional and sector hierarchies based on reputational status.   The issue of institutional title and particularly the legitimate use of the designation 'university college' highlights in microcosm the way in which the pressing and widely-recognised need for the reform of the structure and shape of higher education to ensure increased access and the widening of educational opportunity, it will be argued, has

confronted the elitism and innate conservatism of the wider higher education sector. The continuing failure to reform the structure of higher education in response to these changing demands perpetuates the social injustices emanating from differential access to educational opportunity, justifies the reluctance of elements of the higher education sector to respond to the lifelong learning agenda to which the Government is expressly committed, and threatens the ability of individual institutions whose organisational ethos reflects these new priorities to fulfil these commitments.

This central proposition has four subsidiary strands which are reflected in the structure of the thesis.

First, the thesis maintains that the historical development of the higher education sector and the institutions within it has been piecemeal, unsystematic and status-ridden and, particularly at the level of individual institutions, represents a complex amalgam of political, economic, social and educational issues characterised by a progressive (although often slow and difficult) resolution of the conflicts and tensions inherent in change, and expressed through a range of issues relating to institutional and community aspiration, sponsorship, resistance, community pressures, individual influence, and financial constraint. This analysis of the history of institutional and sector development addresses the fundamental misconception that the reputational status of the universities is based upon longevity and tradition and can, therefore, only be defended by preserving the *status quo.*

The 'traditionalist' view of the issues surrounding the university college title, expressed by those seeking to restrict its use, it will be argued, selectively ignores the origins and history of those institutions which now form part of the mainstream university sector. The successful history of these institutions provides justification for the continuing natural development and growth of the sector and will seek to demonstrate that their current (often recently-acquired) status has been dependent upon a degree of flexibility and adaptability which is currently being denied to current University Colleges whose origins and history, purpose, missions and organisational and community aspirations represent a forceful oppositional argument to the new restrictions on title and name arising from the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, which, even in principle less still through legislation, were not applied to their antecedents. Whilst denying the historical precedent, this same traditionalist view simultaneously calls upon a perceived history of higher education to remind potential reformers of a 'golden age' (Annan, 1990), to be preserved and protected. This view has distorted the perceptions of the benefits and implications of structural reform and threatens the success of the policies relating to lifelong learning, access and increased participation which now form part of a clear and extensively documented Government commitment. (15)

Chapter 3, therefore, seeks to establish a focused historical perspective of the development of the higher education system in two stages. The first element examines the development of groups of institutions based on two typologies, or structural models, and seeks to demonstrate by an analysis at (sub-) sector level that the range of higher education providers constitutes a complex series of sub-strata not amenable to the term 'higher

education system' (Shattock, 1996). This analysis will show that reference to a 'golden age' of British higher education is spurious and that the significant majority of the mainstream universities - which constitute the fabric and preserve the reputation of British higher education - are, in fact, relatively new institutions (Scott, 1995a) which often have developed from inauspicious origins, many from small university colleges. The reputational status of British higher education, it is argued, is therefore falsely presumed to be based on ancient institutions, traditional values, academic standards and pedagogies, confirming as illusory the threat posed by structural reform and changes in institutional status (Beloff, 1973) which are necessary to support the commitment to a mass higher education system geared to progressively increased participation rates and widening access.

The second element of the historical analysis focuses on aspects of institutional development in the (pre-1992) university sector in order to highlight those features of the external political, economic, social, and educational environment, including the pressures of developing communities and the significant (although at times, over-stated) influence of particular individuals, which have substantially determined the successful growth of British universities and reinforced their progressively developing reputation. This approach enables a comparative analysis to be undertaken of the relatively uninhibited developmental path of existing mainstream British universities, many of which originated as university colleges, particularly in the period 1880-1960, and, in marked contrast, that of non-university higher education providers in the 1990s which, although similar in origin, history, context and aspiration and having pursued similar political campaigns

influenced by similar educational, social, economic and community pressures, are experiencing considerable political resistance to the recognition of the institutional status which, it is argued, reflects the nature and level of education and training which they provide. These different outcomes demonstrate the extent to which the considerations which have influenced the determination of the criteria relating to the legitimate use of the university college title in the 1990s are '...*historically disembedded*' (Coffield and Williamson 1997b).

The second strand of the thesis, again based on this historical analysis, maintains that the two main committees of inquiry into higher education which have considered the structure and form of the higher education system in the last three decades have selectively adopted an ahistorical view, ignoring historical precedent in institutional development where this would strengthen the current case which is being made by numerous institutions, whilst, simultaneously, acknowledging and reinforcing the attributions of status and academic prestige which the historical view provides. In confronting the issue of structural reform, this anomalous position has led to political and status considerations relating to the use of the University College title and name prevailing over the pressure for structural reform to accommodate the demand for increased access to educational opportunity.

In Chapter 4, therefore, the study examines the perspectives, approaches and outcomes of the two major reviews of the higher education sector within the last three decades - the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education under Sir Ron Dearing - which have sought to address the re-definition of the purpose, shape and

structure of the higher education system in response to the profound economic, political, social, cultural, and demographic changes which have brought into stark ideological conflict the demands for increased participation and the over-riding concern to maintain the traditional value systems and structures of an elite system. Such an analysis serves not merely to confirm the innate conservatism of major Committees of Inquiry, but also demonstrates that the approaches and the outcomes of these Committees reflect a complex balance between the significance of their composition, the political context in which they were established, the range of political pressures which they experienced, and the weight of representation made during the respective consultation periods. This analysis examines the contexts and priorities of these committees of inquiry and assesses their respective approaches to the issues of structural reform and institutional status, particularly as it relates to the question of University College title, as one means of achieving increased social justice in a democratic and diverse system of higher education, promoting meritocratic social mobility and educational opportunity and reducing the steep gradients of social inequality [16] which are maintained by differential access to the means of communication, learning and knowledge (Robertson, 1997b; Coffield and Williamson 1997b).

This aspect of the study seeks to establish, particularly in the recent context of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 as these relate to institutional title and status, that the commitment of the current Government to increased access and widening participation, as evidenced by substantial additional resources being devoted to these priorities, and the

simultaneous imposition of restrictions upon institutional title and name represent an unresolved policy conflict which stems from the expression of competing (Government and higher education sector) interests. This analysis provides the backdrop for the case study in Chapter 6 which explores the manner in which an individual institution is attempting to deal with this policy conflict in defending its existing status as a provider of higher education and in planning its future priorities.

Prior to the case study of University College Warrington, and linked closely to the historical analysis within Chapter 3, the third strand of the thesis maintains that, as a legacy of the unstructured and piecemeal institutional and sector development, the current anomalies of University College status and title preclude the systematic application of a consistent and widely agreed set of criteria in the 1990s in order to assess the legitimacy of the claim of individual institutions to the University College designation. It is argued that, in the absence of a clear map of the University College sector, the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 relating to the use of institutional title and name, fail to resolve the existing anomalies and, indeed, compound the past failures to provide a rational structure or to define the University College sector and its relationship to other elements of the higher education system with accuracy, consistency and equity.

Chapter 5 of the thesis, therefore, attempts to construct a 'map' of the non-university providers of higher education which are (or may be) referred to, legitimately or otherwise,

as university colleges and which to some extent may form an identifiable sub-sector of higher education. The issue of University College title and the debate regarding its legitimate use by individual (or types of) institutions, encapsulates the tensions and issues of institutional status, market position and the fragmented nature of the sector response to the threats and opportunities represented by the pressures to expand and embrace structural reform which are examined in Chapters 3 and 4 of the thesis. In view of the complexities of institutional and sector development, and the consequent difficulties of establishing clear definitional boundaries relating both to institutions and sectors, this chapter examines the extent to which the title describes in an exclusive and distinctive manner, the series of relationships with the university sector, and seeks to explore the logic, consistency and legitimacy of its differential usage across the further and higher education sectors, particularly in the light of the historical perspectives on institutional development and status in the Chapter 3.

This analysis demonstrates the confusion of status and title which exists and the variation in the range of institutional relationships (and the terms used to describe them) which characterize the work of a significant number of institutions across the further and higher education sectors. The analysis also shows that the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and, indeed, the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, failed to recognize the complexity of the nature, form and structure of higher education beyond the universities and, consequently, failed to create the basis of a consistent, clear and equitable set of criteria to distinguish those institutions with a legitimate claim to the

title University College, and demonstrates that the criteria adopted serve to perpetuate rather than remove anomalies and inequities in institutional status.

The fourth strand of the thesis maintains that the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 failed to recognise the complexities of institutional mission, purpose and structure represented by the term University College. The recommendations of the Dearing Inquiry have been applied differentially (exclusively, it is argued) on the basis of corporate status, in which those further education corporations referred to as University Colleges have been prevented from continuing to use the title and, most importantly, denied the means of fulfilling the criteria established for its legitimate use without radical change to their organizational structure, governance and funding. This approach has failed to recognize the complexities of institutional mission, purpose and structure represented by the term University College.

In Chapter 6, therefore, the thesis identifies by means of a case study of a single institution, Warrington Collegiate Institute, the impact of the outcomes of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the implications of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 as these relate to institutional title. In the case of Warrington Collegiate Institute, this chapter shows that its history and development, institutional profile, relationships with its parent university and sector agencies have direct parallels with many of the institutions considered in Chapter 3; that its organizational structure and priorities are directly related to (in fact pre-date) the lifelong learning agenda now firmly established by the Labour Government; and that the attempt to meet the criteria established

in the legislation to retain the University College title threatens its distinctive structure which reflects its organizational mission. (17)

The case study provides a clear and sharply focused example of the critical issues of institutional title and status and encapsulates the debate relating to institutional and sector reform which have been set out in the preceding chapters. The case study employs four main perspectives on the nature and work of University College Warrington and its response to the threat posed by the loss of university college title: its history and development; institutional profile; its relationship with external agencies; and the political campaign which was mounted to defend its position. This enables a comparative analysis to be undertaken, from a perspective based on the historical account of institutional and sector development in Chapter 3, of the similarities and contrasts of circumstance which influenced decisions relating to changes in institutional status in the pre-Robbins higher education sector and those affecting an individual institution in the 1990s. This allows an examination of the range of political and status considerations which have (differentially) affected organisational and sector development as expressed through institutional titles.

The sequence of this study, therefore, reflects a progressive focusing of analysis involving: (a) the establishment of the broad historical context and an explanation of the impact of the unplanned and unstructured development of higher education at institutional and sector level and the legacy of unresolved complexity which this has bestowed; (b) an analysis of the relative failures of the two Committees of Inquiry established within the last thirty years to address the issues of the structure and form of the higher education sector, as

exemplified by their approach to the issue of the University College title, reflecting the continuing conflicts and tensions of institutional status which are an aspect of the historical legacy and whose recommendations, particularly those of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education have led to an unresolved policy conflict; (c) an attempt to 'map' the university college sector by the identification and application of clear, consistent and equitable criteria; and (d) a case study of Warrington Collegiate Institute which encapsulates the critical elements, tensions and political considerations which have pervaded the University College title issue. This progressive sharpening of the focus preserves the continuity of the themes and enables a range of perspectives on the issues to be drawn at different stages of the study.

2.6 The Originality of the Thesis

The originality of the thesis stems from several sources which relate directly to the aims, content, method and outcomes of the research.

Originality in aims is based on the exploration of the issue of status in higher education through the examination of the historical and current role and sector position of a particular group of institutions. The issue of institutional title and status represents, in unique microcosm, the unresolved tension between the increasing educational, social, political, economic and cultural aspirations which are manifest in the pressure to expand educational opportunity and the existing status hierarchies within the structure of higher education. The group of institutions referred to as university colleges acts as a lens through which the

development of the higher education sector may be viewed, providing an original insight into issues of power and status in higher education policy-making.

Originality in content is provided by the various dimensions of the study. The historical dimension examines the development of the existing university sector from the particular viewpoint of their origins as university colleges, thereby establishing an historical (and comparative) context for the analysis of the composition of the current sector. This focus is continued in the exploration of the political and status considerations relating to university colleges and the approach to structural reform which have influenced the recommendations of the two major reviews of higher education within the last thirty years, identifying, particularly in the case of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in the 1990s, the nature of the policy conflict which been generated by the juxtaposition of different policy perspectives and priorities. The examination of the extent to which these committees of inquiry have based their recommendations relating to institutional title on a clear view of the structure and composition of the university college sector takes the form of a 'mapping' exercise, original in its conception, which has, in substantial part, resulted from the complex historical development of the higher education sector and the *ad hoc* nature of institutional development and inter-institutional relationships. Finally, the originality in the content of the thesis stems from the case study of one institution, University College Warrington, which embraces all the issues discussed in the preceding chapters. The case study examines the nature of the organisation, the historical and developmental parallels with a range of university institutions, its current status and sector relationships and the strategies which it has employed to protect its

institutional standing in the community of higher education providers in the light of the threats to its institutional title and status.

Originality in method is based on the wide range of methodological perspectives which afford a complex and varying view of the central thesis, but which provides a rich research context unavailable to a single-method approach. The combination of historical analysis, policy analysis through documentary research and the use of semi-structured interviews, and the use of the case-study method, provides a progressively focused view and offers an original insight into the range of issues surrounding institutional title and status. This provides a richer type of analysis of policy scholarship than, for example Ball (1990) and Bowe *et al.* (1992) whose analyses neglect the historical or broader contextual dimensions.

Finally, the outcomes of the thesis are original in making a contribution to a range of fields of study. The historical analysis confirms the unstructured and uncontrolled development of the higher education sector and the individual institutions within it. However, contrary to the postmodern position which portrays the diminishing impact of system, structure and form in higher education, the continuing legacy of power and status bequeathed by that history continues to exert profound effects on the current shape and structure of higher education. The outcomes are also significant in understanding change in higher education and informing policy scholarship in the fusion of theory and practice and in relating policy formulation directly to policy implementation at an institutional level.

2.7   The Parameters of the Thesis

There are four clearly established parameters to this thesis: the historical analysis which moves progressively to the civic universities as examples of the early university colleges; the focus on a limited group of higher education institutions which bear the University College title; the selection and close examination of the approaches and outcomes of two national committees of inquiry as significant instruments of policy formulation; and the choice of the case study and the documentation available and used within it.   These parameters represent restrictions on the range of perspectives which are available on complex issues such as status, power and policy-making.   These are consciously identified parameters, however, justifiable on the grounds that they enable the cumulative development of the argument throughout the thesis and permit a clear and rational analysis to be undertaken of the issues surrounding the structural reform of higher education.   The thesis does not, therefore, purport to offer a comprehensive historical survey of higher education nor does it suggest that the case study demonstrates an instance-class relationship which would, in that sense, be generalisable to other contexts.

2.8   The Significance of the Thesis

The transition from elite to mass higher education has become the widely accepted interpretive framework, almost the conventional wisdom, within which the rapid and radical growth in participation rates in higher education has been viewed in the last decade. Robertson and Hillman (1997) demonstrated that the expansion of educational opportunity in the 1990s, though significant, was distributed differentially across a range of previously

excluded groups and, significantly, across a range of types of higher education institutions. This thesis is significant in demonstrating, through an historical overview of the development of the higher education sector and an analysis of the current power and status relationships which determine the relative positioning of institutions, the extent to which the issues of social justice, democratic expansion, equality of opportunity and economic efficiency, conflict with, and continue to be subordinated to, the existing institutional and sector hierarchies, which are often based on misconceived reputational status. The commitment to the continued widening of access to those who can benefit from, and contribute to, higher education is consequently profoundly threatened. The significance of the thesis rests on the primacy of the issue of educational opportunity. The thesis demonstrates, importantly, that the issue of status in higher education requires a clear understanding of the historical origins of institutions and the sector as a whole. Policy formulation which seeks to promote the concepts of social justice and democracy in educational opportunity but which ignores, attempts to sweep away, or indeed, defers to cherished status, however recent or unreliable its foundation, has within it, the seeds of its own failure. The thesis is significant in demonstrating how the role and status of University Colleges in the latter part of the twentieth century have reflected the inability of policy makers to resolve this continuing conflict of interest

Notes

1.   Although positivism is a recurrent feature of western philosophy from the Ancient Greeks to the present day the term is attributed to Auguste Comte who consciously 'invented' the new science of society (von Wright: 1992). The term 'positivism' has been used in many different ways by philosophers and social scientists which has, over time, rendered its meaning less precise and consistent. The term has been applied to the doctrine of 'logical positivism' most famously associated with Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle in the 1920s in which the central meaning of a

statement is provided by the method of its verification. Unverifiable statements are held to be meaningless with metaphysics and theology as the principal targets of criticism.

Positivism represents a collection of prohibitions concerning human knowledge, intended to confine the description 'knowledge' or 'science' to the results of those operations that are observable in the evolution of the modern natural sciences.

> 'Throughout its history the particular concern of positivism has been to turn the polemical cutting edge to metaphysical speculation of every kind, and hence against all reflection that either cannot found its conclusions on empirical data or formulates its judgements in such a way that can never be contradicted by empirical data'
>
> (Kolakowski, 1992: 7-8)

The focus on explanation, generalisability, controllability, replicability, prediction and proof are the hallmarks of positivism (Maykut and Moorhouse, 1994). The positivist or natural science approach is the dominant paradigm in most forms of quantitative social research and emphasises universal laws of causation which are based on an explanatory framework which assumes a realistic ontology, that is, that reality consists of a world of objectively defined facts. Quantification is crucial to this approach since it renders the concepts within theoretical schemes or hypotheses observable, manipulable and testable. It is a necessary condition for the findings of research to be replicable and generalisable and to enable prediction on the basis of observed regularities (Henwood and Pidgeon, 1993).

The critique of positivism as mechanistic, trivialising and reductionist, excluding notions of choice, freedom, individuality and moral responsibility is extensive. von Wright comments that:

> 'The antipositivist philosophy of science...is a much more diverse and heterogeneous trend than positivism. Representatives of this type of thought included some eminent German philosophers, historians and social scientists. Perhaps the best known of them are Droysen, Dilthey, Simmel and Max Weber. Windelband and Rickert of the neo-Kantian School are related to them. The Italian Croce and eminent British philosopher of history and art Collingwood may be said to belong to the idealist wing of this anti-positivist trend in methodology'
>
> (von Wright, 1992: 10-11).

The revolt against positivism occurred on a broad front involving philosophers, scientists, social critics and creative artists, most notably William Blake, the poet who maintained that

> 'No matter how exact measurement may be, it can never give us experience of life, for life cannot be weighed and measured on a physical scale'
>
> (Nesfield-Cookson in Cohen and Manion, 1987: 23).

Phenomenology, alternatively, focuses on the meaning of events for the research subjects (Patton, 1990) and confronts the uncritical adherence to the natural science model characterised by its reductionist approach to human consciousness and, in its broadest sense, views behaviour as determined by the phenomena of experience rather than by external, objective and physically described reality. The anti-positivist movement, although fragmented, is unified in the common rejection of the belief that human behaviour is governed by general laws and underlying regularities. This view in several social science disciplines, most notably psychology and sociology, has led to

the establishment of humanistic strands to operate co-laterally with more traditional behaviouristic approaches.

This alternative epistemological position is expressed in the naturalistic or interpretive paradigm - referred to as the emerging paradigm (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) - and confronts the natural science model and its reductionist approach to human consciousness, drawing its broad insights from the related traditions of hermeneutics and phenomenology.

The oppositional arguments within these differing philosophical positions have most frequently manifested themselves in the form of extended debate regarding the respective merits of quantitative and qualitative research and their validity in different contexts, although Bryman (1988) maintains that significant confusion exist due to a lack of clarity about what constitutes qualitative and quantitative research. He suggests that this confusion, in part, stems from the narrow association of qualitative methodology either with particular modes of gathering data (typically interviews or fieldwork) or its non-numeric character (for example verbal protocols, verbatim transcriptions of interviews, or fieldnotes from participant observation studies).

This fundamental philosophical divergence is based on different constructions and interpretations of social reality and the series of differing assumptions, or postulates, which define them. Burrell and Morgan (1979) have identified sets of such assumptions which underpin these differing conceptions of the social world, namely; contrasting ontologies, epistemologies and models of human nature which, in turn, have direct implications for the methodological concerns of researchers.

Differing ontological assumptions, nominalist or realist, refer to the essence of the social phenomena under investigation and relate to the question of whether social reality exists external to individual consciousness or is a product of it; whether reality is of an objective nature or the result of individual cognition. Contrasting epistemological assumptions relate to the question of the nature, form, acquisition and communication of knowledge and are centred on the question whether 'knowledge' is hard, real and capable of being transmitted in tangible form (the positivist or natural science stance) or softer, more subjective, based on experience and insight of a unique and essentially personal nature (the naturalistic or interpretive, anti-positivist view). The third set of assumptions refer to models of human nature and range from the portrayal of human beings responding mechanically to their environment, as products of that environment and conditioned by external circumstances (referred to as the determinist view); the other as initiators of their own actions, creators of the social environment and exercising 'free will' (voluntarism).

Whilst recognising the extreme positions which these descriptions represent, it is clear that to the extent that researchers tend to one position or another, such contrasting approaches demand different research methods. Investigators adopting an objectivist (or positivist) approach and who regard the social world and social phenomena as representing an objective reality external to the individual will tend to select a range of traditional methodological options in which the scientific investigation will be focused on analysing the relationships and regularities between selected factors (nomothetic techniques). It will demand of the researcher an observer role together with an allegiance to the methods of natural science. Others, adopting a subjectivist (antipositivist or phenomenological) approach are more likely to utilise more recent and emerging techniques such as participant observation and personal constructs and will necessitate a closer involvement with their research subjects than the natural scientist (idiographic techniques).

Borg and Gall remind us that many large-scale research projects have successfully utilised a combination of methodologies and suggest that the debate has served to

> '......polarize the qualitative and quantitative positions and to foster the belief that the only available option is a choice between these two extremes......The solution is to realise that the debate is inappropriately stated. There is no need to choose

a research method on the basis of a traditional paradigmatic stance. Nor is there any reason to pick between two polar opposite paradigms. Thus, there is no need for a dichotomy between the method types and there is every reason......to use them together to satisfy the demands of evaluation research in the most efficacious manner possible'

(Borg and Gall, 1989: 381-2).

2. Critical theory was originally associated with the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research in the 1920s and 1930s, a Marxist research foundation which brought together major philosophers and theorists including Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse, Benjamin, Fromm, Pollock, Neumann and others. The continuing influence of these noted Marxist theoreticians is seen in the work of contemporary education policy analysts such as Ozga and Gewirtz (1994)

3. See Weber's Address to the Association for Social Policy (1913) entitled 'Value Judgement in Social Science' in W.G. Runciman (ed.) (1978) *Weber Selections in Translation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

4. This resonates with the view of several contemporary authors, for example L. Harvey (1990) in Critical Social Research   London, Unwin Hyman;   P. Reason (1994) in Participation in Human Inquiry   London, Sage; and P. Reason and J. Rowan (eds.) (1981) Human Inquiry : A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research   Chichester, John Wiley and Son.

5. A more complete account of these issues and their impact on historical research as a methodological tool is provided in W.W. Brickman (1982) Educational Historiography: Tradition, Theory, and Technique, Cherry Hill, New Jersey, Emeritus, Inc.

6. This romanticised view is evident in the historical accounts and the descriptions of the development of a number of institutions.   This is particularly the case where the growth and recognition of the status of an institution was related to issues of national or community identity.   For example, G. Jones and M. Quinn (1983) *Fountains of Praise: University College Cardiff* 1883-1983 Cardiff, Cardiff University Press.

7. Many of the historical accounts of the development of the universities are constructed around the role of a particular individual or group who were prominent in the campaigns for university status for various institutions (Bettenson, 1971; Caine, 1963; Childs, 1933; Fiddes, 1937; Gallie, 1960; Gosden and Taylor, 1975; Holt, 1977; McKinlay, 1991; Pemberton and Pemberton, 1979; Price, 1990; Shattock,1991; Williams, 1993).   In many of these instances the influence and impact of particular individuals is emphasised since many of the accounts are commissioned (or are, in any event, written) as an element of the university archive to commemorate centenaries or other anniversaries.   Such accounts need to be treated circumspectly and balanced with the wider policy context in which the development of particular institutions was either encouraged or impaired.

8. With the notable exception of the University for Industry, a creation of the new (or New)Labour Government, which, despite extensive publicity, eludes definition in the wider system of higher education.

9. For example, statistical data may indicate a declining per capita unit of resource from central funding sources in higher education, but the impact may be minimised by means of the presentation of a statement of the overall income to a university which demonstrates that the income from external (i.e. commercial, non-governmental) sources has risen as a proportion of the whole, which to many observers may be a desirable outcome, indeed a policy objective.

10. Sets of ethical guidelines have been produced by, for example, the British Psychological Society (1978); the British Sociological Association (1982); and the British Educational Research

Association (1989). Comparable statements may be found in other disciplines such as medicine, business and journalism. For an examination of the central ethical issues in these other areas see A. Serafini (ed.) (1989) Ethics and Social Concern New York, Paragon House.

11. The nature, form and legitimacy of the use of deception in various experiments in behavioural sciences, specifically psychology, is discussed in detail in W.R. Borg and M.D. Gall *Educational Research* (fifth edition). New York: Longman. The debate refers to 19% (of 1000 research reports) of psychological research studies providing inaccurate information to subjects regarding the nature of the research. R. J. Menges (1973) 'Openness and Honesty Versus Coercion and Deception in Psychological Research. Vol. 28: 1030-1034

Often ethical principles conflict. For example, the classic study of obedience in which study subjects were ordered to administer increasingly severe electric shocks to another individual in the context of a learning experiment (but, in fact, in which the person supposedly being shocked was a member of the research team and therefore no shocks were administered), shows the complexity of the issue of deception. In this case it was deemed to be more ethical to deceive the research subjects than to inflict physical harm to a participant. Milgram, S. (1963) 'Behavioural Study of Obedience' *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*. Vol. 67:371-378.

12. Cohen and Manion (1994) provide an account of the ethical issues involved in the Stanford Prison Experiment in which the psychological well-being of research participants was endangered. This highlights the tensions between the value of free scientific inquiry in pursuit of truth and knowledge and the need to preserve the dignity and physical and psychological well-being of individuals. Zimbardo (1984), adopting an absolutist position considered that no research should be conducted which violated the biological or psychological integrity of any human being *regardless* of the benefits which might, or would, accrue to society. The relativist position is required to demonstrate that such benefits outweigh the harm and/or risks, a more complex and difficult proposition.

13. Seventeen different formulations of the concept of validity are identified in a forthcoming publication on research methods. These are content validity; criterion-related validity; construct validity; internal validity; external validity; concurrent validity; face validity; jury validity; predictive validity; consequential validity; systemic validity; catalytic validity; ecological validity descriptive validity; interpretive validity; theoretical validity; and evaluative validity. . [L. Cohen, L. Manion and K.R.B. Morrison (forthcoming) *Research Methods in Education* (fifth edition). London: Routledge].

14. Examples of such statistical validity tests which establish correlation coefficients are the Spearman-Brown rank order correlation and the Pearson product moment correlation. Descriptions of these techniques are provided in L. Cohen and L. Manion (1994) *Research Methods in Education* (fourth edition). London: Routledge.

15. In Opposition, the Labour Party produced a consultation document entitled 'Lifelong Learning' (The Labour Party, 1996) which was submitted to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and which set out the Labour position on the future of higher education , particularly its role in Target 2000 (to ensure that all young people gained Level 2 qualifications as a minimum); tackling youth unemployment; support for adults in further education; and increased access to further and higher education.

Arguably, the greatest threat to the pre-1992 university sector in Britain is not that posed by changes in institutional status which enable non-university higher education institutions to increase the amount and level of higher education they undertake, but rather, the universities' failure to grasp the new agenda of widening participation and increased access as expressed in 'The Learning Age' (DfEE, 1998). This challenge is comparable to, perhaps more threatening, than, the intellectual

crises and conflicts of values and purpose which the university sector has experienced in recent decades (Scott,1984; Barnett, 1990; 1997).

16.   The concept of social justice refers to a de-rationing of higher education in order not merely to promote national economic effectiveness but in determining individual life-chances. Robertson argues that

> *'Despite the progress since Robbins, and thereafter since the 1987 White Paper, participation in higher education remains inadequate for a fair, modern and competitive society. The social position and social composition of universities continues poorly to reflect social equity... and for as long as universities are not employed as agents of social equity, then social justice cannot be harnessed to national effectiveness'*

(Robertson, 1995: 46).

On the issue of a democratic system of higher education, Robertson is equally clear in suggesting that a major problem of UK higher education rests with the images which are used in its defence. These images, he argues

> *'...are sponsored both by our wider culture and by the universities themselves, and they speak of closure and enclosure-closure with respect to democratic accessibility and, once entered, enclosure with respect to the practices and discourses which define the cultural space of the university – a double rejection of the openness and accountability required by democratic public service'*

(Robertson, 1995: 47).

17.   Warrington Collegiate Institute is a 'mixed economy' further and higher education institution which has four major organizational divisions within it: two further education colleges dealing with separate elements of the subject curriculum; a Directorate of Lifetime Learning which is responsible for the adult education and basic skills provision within the Institute; and University College in which is located all the undergraduate and postgraduate work of the Institute.

CHAPTER 3

SECTOR AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

3.1   Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of the development of universities and the university college sector since the end of the nineteenth century in order to demonstrate that the close relationship between expressions of institutional aspiration and issues of politics, status and power has constituted a permanent and significant determinant of the nature, form and rate of institutional and sector development.   This detailed analysis will show the extent to which the historical development of higher education and its institutions has been piecemeal, unsystematic and status-ridden.   In particular, at the level of individual institutions, this chapter will demonstrate that changes in institutional title and status have resulted from a complex (often fortuitous) amalgam of political, economic, social and educational issues and has been characterized by a progressive (often slow and difficult) resolution of the conflicts and tensions inherent in change, and expressed through a range of issues relating to institutional and community aspiration, sponsorship, resistance, community pressures, individual influence, and financial constraint.   This analysis will provide the broader context for the consideration in later chapters of the confusions and complexities of the university college sector and the status of those institutions which it comprises, and will demonstrate the extent to which these issues continue to dominate the debate relating to institutional title and status.

3.2   Change and the Crisis of Authority

Although this thesis is centrally concerned with structural reform in British higher education and the shape of the sector and the status of institutions, it is clear that structure and form are inextricably linked.   To that extent, it has been suggested that structural changes necessitated by the transition from an elite to a mass system of higher education take place in the context of three dominant strands within the European university tradition: the 'knowledge' model represented by the Humboldtian university in Germany, which placed research at the heart of higher education; the 'professional' model represented by France's *grandes écoles* which was designed to educate civil and public servants and professionals; and the 'personality' model, centred on Oxford and Cambridge and adopted more generally across the British university sector (perhaps to enhance reputational status rather than from a commitment to the model) which aspired to civilize by initiation into a liberal intellectual tradition (Gellert, 1993).   It is argued that the main difficulty in attempting to reconcile the 'personality' tradition of the elite model with mass access is that its intimacy is threatened by the imperatives of mass higher education.   Scott maintains that

> '....nostalgia, even grief, for a lost intimacy, an academic Arcadia, acts as a
> silent drag on progress towards wider access and advance towards mass
> higher education. A mass system enrolling a third of the age group, mass
> institutions with tens of thousands of students in which donnish collegiality
> is a fading memory, mass practices in teaching and research are
> confronted by the instincts of an elite age.'
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 7).

The implications of such changes require higher education to reconcile its traditional role in providing a 'rite of passage', a transforming function offering the cultivation of independence of thought, elitist and based on the universal intellectual utilizing recondite

66

vocabularies as barriers to comprehension, with the emergence of frequently contesting and contradictory sources of knowledge (Smith and Webster, 1997) and increasing disconnections between education, work, lifestyle and identity. The postmodern analysis maintains that these challenges to the universities have led to developing crisis of authority and credibility. Whilst the university system may ultimately offer the necessary sequence and continued life opportunities within the development of a mass system of higher education, the current debate centres upon the breakdown of the established university and whether the institution can adapt its philosophy, practice and structures to respond to postmodern world with

> '....the feverish search for the new self-definition and, ideally, a new identity...(and)...the universal melting of identities dispersal of authorities, and the growing fragmentariness of life....'

(Smith and Webster, 1997: 21).

These developments, characterised by the transformation of knowledge from its previously homogeneous form, based on strong academic disciplines, to multiple, contested, knowledges which are non-hierarchical, pluralistic, transdisciplinary, fast-changing and socially responsive, it is suggested, announce an end to the established and common purposes of the university, unable to respond to the alternative sources of knowledge, changing approaches to teaching and learning methodologies and the threat to its monopolistic authority (Gibbons et. al., 1994).

The analysis of this decline, however, underestimates the adaptability of the university (Bauman, 1997) and the permanence and continuing influence of positional and reputational status. The realities of hierarchies of difference between universities continue

67

to inhibit structural reform, leading to a paradox of the coexistence of greater inclusion as the effects of the expansion of the higher education sector proceeds, and greater exclusivity, intensified by the strengthening of the basis of tradition, hierarchy, and prestige as influencing factors for both students and employers. It is suggested that:

> *'....this hardly proves the existence of a postmodern era in which, allegedly, differentiation leads to impenetrable complexity. The distinguishing traits remain clear, at least to potential employers...the patterns of recruitment also raise the issue of....social justice.'*
> (Smith and Webster, 1997: 11).

From whatever psychological or experiential base, the reluctance to initiate fundamental structural reform and the unwillingness to accept the structural implications of recognizing the value and contribution of separate and distinctive institutions, particularly university colleges (but also including the concept of the community college, based on the American model) engaged in managing the transition from elite to mass higher education, has constituted a recurring theme in the development of the British higher education system (Trow, 1964; 1998; Bereday, 1973; Benn and Fieldhouse, 1993).

This chapter therefore explores, in two distinct elements, the phases in the development of the British university 'system' and the progressive erosion of institutional autonomy resulting from the developing primacy of state planning and, in parallel, examines the range of categories of institution within the system, seeking to explain by reference to their historical origins and their vulnerabilities of status, the basis of their resistance to structural reform in the face of perceived threats to their market position from the wider sector. First, the analysis will show the piecemeal, unsystematic and status-ridden nature of the development of higher education institutions over the last century and, consequently will

question the extent to which this unstructured and *ad hoc* nature of institutional and sector development may be regarded as progress towards a 'system' (Shattock, 1996). Secondly, by means of two models of categorisation, the first developed by the Robbins Committee itself and the second established by Scott (1995a) and available to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, the analysis will demonstrate the rapid fragmentation of the higher education sector in the three decades between the two committees of inquiry and the increasingly complex range of institutional providers of higher education which has occurred in the face of the trend towards progressive rationalisation by successive governments, for example the ending of the 'binary' divide. Third, the chapter, in setting the broader context of institutional and sector reform, will refute the (arguably) misconceived view that the reputational status of the higher education system, and of individual institutions within it, is justified by its longevity and tradition, somehow reflecting a 'golden age' of higher education which must be preserved. The analysis consequently questions the basis upon which the status of many of those institutions which have strenuously opposed the reform of the higher education sector, is founded.

3.3   The Evolution of a National 'System' of Higher Education

In the early 1960s the Robbins Committee (1) had rejected proposals for the establishment and endorsement of university colleges, recommending that the demands of future expansion should be met by developing the existing types of institution. This view was reinforced by the opposition of successive Secretaries of State several decades later when the university college title had been assumed by a range of institutions during the 1990s on the basis, it was argued, more of aspiration than legality. It was further emphasized by

the categoric and restrictive conclusions of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, (2) criticizing the lack of institutional self-discipline in the use of institutional titles (1997, Para. 16.15: 253), a view endorsed by the Government's response to the Report's conclusions on this issue (DfEE, 1997a).

In view of this recurrent opposition to, and inflexibility in, accommodating structural reform, it is both necessary and valuable to incorporate within this study an historical perspective of the structure of the higher education sector and an analysis of its evolution with a particular focus on the university college title to show the extent to which the logic which has underpinned the resistance to reform is based on a misconceived view of the origins of many of the most prestigious institutions in British higher education, and to demonstrate the extent to which the University College title has been instrumental in the development of some of those (now well established and highly regarded) institutions in the university sector.

Scott (1995a) maintains that the transition from elite to mass higher education (3) is not amenable to simplistic interpretation based on the evolution of systems, for example the expansion of student numbers or particular piecemeal structural reforms. Nor can it be explained through the substitution of one paradigm labelled 'mass' for another labelled 'elite'. Rather, it must be interpreted more widely

> '....in the context of the restless synergy between plural modernisations - of the academy, polity, economy, society and culture.'
> (Scott, 1995a: 10).

To the extent that this view is accepted, the tension between mass structures and elite instincts should be recognized as a permanent feature of mass higher education systems rather than the growing pains of transition. However, the transition to mass higher education has generated increasing pressure for wider structural reform following the most recent changes to the higher education sector in 1992. (4) In the context of the narrower consideration of institutional status and the resistance to structural reform which institutional aspiration has constantly confronted, it is essential to examine the basis on which the opposition to further reform rests. (5)

This chapter therefore explores, in two distinct elements, the phases in the development of the British university 'system' and the progressive erosion of institutional autonomy resulting from the developing primacy of state planning and, in parallel, examines the range of categories of institution within the system, seeking to explain by reference to their historical origins and their vulnerabilities of status, the basis of their resistance to structural reform in the face of perceived threats to their market position from the wider sector. First, the analysis will show the piecemeal, unsystematic and status-ridden nature of the development of higher education institutions over the last century and, consequently will question the extent to which this unstructured and *ad hoc* nature of institutional and sector development may be regarded as progress towards a 'system' (Shattock, 1996). Secondly, by means of two models of categorisation, the first developed by the Robbins Committee itself and the second established by Scott (1995a) and available to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, the analysis will demonstrate the rapid fragmentation of the higher education sector in the three decades between the two committees of inquiry and

the increasing complexity of the range of institutional providers of higher education which has occurred in the face of the trend towards progressive rationalization by successive governments, for example the ending of the 'binary' divide. Third, the chapter, in setting the broader context of institutional and sector reform, will refute the arguably misconceived view that the reputational status of the higher education system, and of individual institutions within it, is based on longevity and tradition, somehow reflecting a 'golden age' of higher education which must be preserved. The analysis consequently questions the basis upon which the status of many of those institutions which have strenuously opposed the reform of the higher education sector, is founded.

3.4 The Changing Relationship between Higher Education and the State

For some commentators, the changing relationship between government and higher education in Britain has represented the progressive privatization of a university system regarded as '...*inefficient, wasteful and unresponsive*' (Walford, 1991: 172). For others, however, the growth of a national system of higher education has been a function of the development of the planning role of the modern nation state which, in recent decades, has increasingly assumed the role of the sponsor of new institutions and promoted the structured, planned growth and funding of higher education (Booth, 1987) involving the subordination of the autonomous universities to the direction of the state and the progressive centralization of responsibilities formerly exercised by other agencies such as the churches and local government. This represents the transition from voluntarism to statism in the provision of higher education and has signalled the transformation of the

relationship between the universities and the state through five distinct phases: 1945-1960s; 1960s-1970s; 1970s-1981; 1981-1990; and the 1990s (Scott, 1995a).

First, in the period between 1945 and the early 1960s the University Grants Committee (UGC) mediated between the government and the sector and fulfilled a planning role which included the development of the 'redbrick' university colleges, the expansion of the existing civic universities and the designation of the 'new' universities (Berdahl, 1959; Stewart, 1989). Throughout this period the UGC, having modified its terms of reference in 1946 explicitly to take account of the national demands on higher education, was transformed from a body which merely provided deficit funding to one which became centrally engaged in the planning of higher education (Shattock, 1984).

However, the success of the UGC [6] in promoting the work and the development of British universities encouraged the idea of a national system of higher education to replace the loose grouping of autonomous institutions. In the immediate post-war phase, particularly in response to the increasingly technology-based economy, successive governments tentatively explored the development of higher education outside the university sector and beyond the control of the UGC. The clearest example of this approach was the establishment of the colleges of advanced technology, announced in the 1956 White Paper, [7] to be directly funded by the Ministry of Education. Most significantly,

> '....the post-war development of further education meant that the
> contribution of non-university institutions could no longer be ignored'
> (Scott, 1995a: 16).

The second phase, the 1960s, characterized as the Robbins-Crosland years, saw the UGC fade in significance, its influence on the future structure of higher education undermined by the prominence and status of the Robbins Committee, and witnessed the further decline of the autonomous university tradition, the dominant contemporary interpretation being that its recommendations which supported and promoted the universities were rejected by the (then) Minister of State, Anthony Crosland, in favour of a binary system (8) motivated by anti-university prejudice (Scott,1995a). The establishment of a binary structure was crucial, marking

> '.... the most single decisive episode in the building of our present
> higher education system'
>
> (Scott, 1988: 33).

The prescription of the Robbins Committee, involving the expansion of the autonomous universities and the enlargement of the university sector through the promotion of the colleges of advanced technology and subsequently the regional colleges of technology (which became the core of the polytechnic sector), was rejected in favour of expansion based on 'accountable' polytechnics. However, the Report endorsed and encouraged the growth of higher education and the creation of not merely a system, but a public system of higher education (Scott, 1988). This phase of the development of a national system of higher education, led by the commanding achievements of the Robbins Committee, instinctively committed to a institutional autonomy but able to advocate with equanimity greatly increased state intervention in higher education, saw

> '....the invisible but decisive frontier that separated the
> private from the public....crossed. Higher education had been
> brought within the irresistible orbit of state power'
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 34).

During this period the Department of Education was established (to which the UGC reported) and the autonomy of the universities was further restricted by the requirement to submit institutional accounts to Parliamentary scrutiny and the introduction of the public expenditure survey system designed to plan social expenditure as a whole.

The third phase in the development of a national system and the erosion of institutional autonomy witnessed the progressive absorption of the UGC into the Whitehall structure (Carswell, 1985). The collapse of the system of quinquennial grant under the inflationary pressures and the economic crises of the mid-1970s led to the introduction of a three-year rolling grant structure which signalled that the original distant relationship between higher education and the state, mediated through the UGC, was at an end. The need for national co-ordination of higher education applied particularly to the management of (now) two sectors with

> '....a high cost 'university' economy built round a defence of the unit of resource, and a low-cost 'polytechnic' economy based on productivity gains'
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 18).

The fourth phase began in the period following the 1981 funding cuts in which the waning influence of the UGC was 'cruelly exposed' (Scott, 1995a). Indeed, as the universities were requested to reduce intakes by 5 per cent to provide partial protection of the unit of resource against a 15 per cent cut in funding, and the Universities and the UGC positions diverged, the UGC assumed an increasingly executive role in determining and monitoring student number targets, implementing subject reviews and embarking on research assessment. Increasingly subordinated to the DES, the development of the university

sector would be required henceforth to conform to the strategic direction set by government.

A parallel development in the management of the polytechnic sector was the establishment in 1982 of the National Advisory Body for Public Sector Higher Education which enabled the more effective control and articulation of the discrete university and polytechnic sectors in a single system in which the UGC and the universities were a diminishing element.

The establishment of the Polytechnic and Colleges Funding Council with the implementation of the Education Reform Act in 1988-89 to replace the National Advisory Body which had failed to resolve the tensions between the DES and the local education authorities in the management of the polytechnics, and the simultaneous creation of the Universities Funding Council (to replace the UGC) provided an administrative symmetry in the continuing decline of university domination in the provision of higher education and reflected the new emphasis on a public sector, increasingly accountable to government and its agencies through centralized planning (Booth, 1987).

This began the fifth, and, in a sense, current phase of this process of subordination to a range of planning and funding bodies acting through or on behalf of government, and the consequent, progressive loss of autonomy for the universities. The Universities Funding Council (UFC), by its nature, was regarded by the universities as a manifestation of their diminishing influence while, for the polytechnics and colleges, the Polytechnic and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC) represented national recognition, greater operational

freedom and status gain. These new councils were established as statutory agencies with almost identical terms of reference. In retrospect, they were too alike to remain apart (Scott, 1995a: 20).

In 1992 the binary system, as it had been constructed in the late 1960s, was abandoned and replaced by unified, national (in fact sub-national) higher education funding councils for England (HEFCE), Scotland (SHEFC) and Wales (HEFCW). The changes in 1992 were significant in other respects and represented to some extent, contradictory developments. First, the Welsh system incorporated both higher and further education, thereby creating the possibility of the vertical integration of all post-secondary education. (9) Second, at that time the further education colleges were removed from the control of the local authorities and became the responsibility of the Further Education Funding Council, thus establishing a new binary divide, but more fundamentally, removing further education from purely local environments to be funded and planned in a national context. Scott maintains that

> '*The final result....(of the recent reforms).... may be a radical enlargement of the higher education system to embrace further education colleges.....Just as in the mid-twentieth century the notion of higher education was expanded to include the proto-polytechnics and training colleges as well as universities , so in the late twentieth century it may be extended again to include all post-secondary institutions '.*
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 21-22).

In fact, the evidence of the outcomes of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Government support for its recommendations, suggest that an entirely different logic has prevailed. An alternative interpretation of the influence of these historical developments on the university sector is that, having experienced the turbulence

and threat of the admission of the former polytechnics to the ranks of universities, the pre-1992 universities are resistant to further structural reform affecting institutional status. It may also be argued, and the position of the CVCP in the period of consultation confirms this, that the post-1992 universities were particularly jealous of their new and hard-won status and were therefore equally (possibly more) resistant to further changes or 'drifts' in the status of non-university institutions providing higher education. (10)

An examination of the circumstances of the establishment and changing status of the institutions which have variously comprised the university sector throughout the period provides a detailed counterpoint to the analysis of the development of a national 'system' of higher education and shows at institutional level the *ad hoc* and piecemeal nature of institutional development and the factors which determined the successful growth of numerous institutions from university colleges to universities.

3.5 Two Models of Classification of the Sector

The categorisation and classification of those institutions comprising the higher education sector is itself illuminating. The changing nature of British higher education over several decades has inevitably produced a range of typologies and systems of classification with differences in form and rationale but with a significant degree of commonality. The two models of classification discussed below, the first derived from the approach of the Robbins Committee to the issue of the structure of the sector and the second based on the analytical framework established by Scott (1995a) in his exploration of the meanings of

mass higher education, span the most rapid and extensive period of structural change in the history of British higher education

3.5.1 Model One

This first model informed the deliberations of the Robbins Committee and, regardless of the outcomes of its Report in initiating structural change in the sector, was clearly the product of its time. This model resulted from a period and process of gradual incremental change since the end of the nineteenth century, but which at the time of the formation of the Committee (indeed, arguably, as a primary motive for its establishment), was accelerating amidst major demographic and social change. The consequent significant growth in demand for university education was occurring in a sector whose existing structure was unable to accommodate it.

The Robbins Committee categorized the university sector as comprising seven groups consisting of thirty-one universities including some 'new' universities which were in the planning stages at the time of the Report: (i) Oxford and Cambridge; collegiate universities providing 16 per cent of all university places; (ii) the four ancient Scottish universities of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Aberdeen and Edinburgh, founded in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and largely non-residential, reflecting continental traditions; (iii) the University of London, a structurally complex federation of colleges formally constituted by charter in 1836; (iv) the older civic universities of England (in order of foundation, Durham, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield and Bristol) founded in the nineteenth century or before the first world war, and responsible for one-

third of all university students in the country; (v) the University of Wales, a federation of three colleges, Aberystwyth, Cardiff and Bangor, established in 1893; (vi) the younger civic universities, Reading, Nottingham, Southampton, Hull, Exeter and Leicester which attained university status after the second world war (except Reading which acquired its charter in 1926) - this group included Keele which was a university college founded after the second world war and which taught its own degrees under the sponsorship of three other universities until it became a university in 1962; and (vii) the 'new' universities, Sussex, East Anglia, York, Kent, Essex, Warwick and Lancaster which, in contrast to the university colleges previously established, were granted degree-awarding powers from the outset and, notably, were expected to be largely non-residential (Robbins, 1963). In addition to this, the Robbins Committee gave extensive consideration to teacher training institutions and Colleges of Art and Technology as part of the higher education system.

The significance of *Model One* for this analysis is that, produced merely three decades ago reflecting the (then) existing arrangements, it is a simple construct adopting a unified categorisation, reflecting a relatively undifferentiated and unitary structure, in marked contrast to *Model Two* set out below. In part the distinctions between the two models are the result of the 'finer-grain' analysis employed in *Model Two* but, most significantly, demonstrate clearly that the current higher education sector is increasingly fragmented and, indeed, characterized more by its newness than its antiquity, thereby undermining the view that the sector and its reputational status is built on tradition and longevity.

3.5.2   Model Two

Three decades later, Scott (1995a) presented an alternative categorisation whose differences (although clearly attributable in part to the structural development of the sector following and, in some cases, resulting directly from the Robbins Report) demonstrated the marked changes that occurred in the intervening period in broadening the base of higher education provision and, importantly, mapped the development and changing status of institutions in the formation of a public, accountable system of higher education.

In this classification Scott identifies essentially seventeen distinct components (11) of the higher education system.   The first category comprises Oxford and Cambridge which, although no longer dominating the university system numerically, remain exceptional in governance; maintaining a collegiate model in which the college and its fellows rather than the department and its professors are the primary academic unit; and in influence where their academic hegemony is maintained through the 'colonizing' process in which their graduates dominate the higher echelons of academe, and through leadership in research and scholarly activity.

The second sub-sector is formed by the University of London as the largest federal university in Britain.   Like Oxford and Cambridge (but for different reasons), London is preferentially funded to reflect the concentration of high-cost medical education.   As a federal institution, London is exceptional in its organization, incorporating large schools such as Imperial College, University College, the London School of Economics and a range of small, specialist institutions. (12)

81

The Victorian civic universities (13) and the younger civics (14) - the 'redbrick' universities, constitute the third and fourth sub-sectors and, on the basis of their direct involvement in the university college title issue, a detailed analysis of the origins and historical development of these institutions forms the substantial remainder of this chapter.

The fifth sub-sector comprises two institutions considered to be *sui generis*, Durham (15) and Keele, (16) established more than a century apart. Durham, cast in the long shadow of the Cathedral, is essentially a national institution with distinctive origins whose location amidst the closed pits and abandoned shipyards of the north-east is incidental (Scott, 1995a). Keele, formerly the University College of North Staffordshire, emerged as a result of a commitment to an educational experiment (Gallie, 1960) to provide a broad undergraduate education and was driven by a liberal paternalism and civic pride reminiscent of Victorian England.

The technological universities, formerly colleges of advanced technology, (17) form the sixth sub-sector whose basis was in Engineering (given the difficulties of recruiting undergraduate engineers) and despite diversification into business and management, has limited their potential for success. The experiences of Bath and Loughborough in contrast to Aston and Salford, particularly in the early 1980s, testify to the variability of their fortunes. Implicitly modelled on the American examples such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and emerging from the Robbins SISTER concept (Special Institutions of Scientific and Technological Education and Research), this was an important

departure in institutional development based on technology transfer and active collaboration with industry.

The seventh sub-sector consists of the Scottish universities which may be further divided into 'ancient' (Aberdeen, Edinburgh, Glasgow and St Andrew's); civic (Dundee); technological (Strathclyde and Heriot-Watt); 'old' new (Stirling); and 'new' new (Napier, Glasgow Caledonian, Abertay, Robert Gordon and Paisley). The ancient universities have contributed inestimably to the distinctive Scottish national heritage and culture, and the impact of the number of sub-divisions is mitigated by the existence of a generally uniform secondary school structure.

The eighth sub-sector consists of the University of Wales and the University of Glamorgan, the former Polytechnic of Wales. The Welsh system conforms more readily to the English model on the basis of the closer integration of the school system and the cross-flow of students. The University of Wales is distinctive in at least two aspects. First, its origins are deeply embedded in a nationalist consciousness [18] and, secondly, it is a federal university which, whilst allowing its constituent colleges effective autonomy, has enabled a greater diversity of institutional types to survive, including large institutions such as the University of Wales College of Cardiff and University of Wales, Lampeter, [19] Britain's smallest university institution.

The two northern Ireland universities, Queen's and Ulster, form the ninth sub-sector. The former is characteristic of the English civic universities, while the latter was formed from a

merger between an old 'new' university, the New University of Ulster and the Polytechnic of Ulster, still the only example of a university-polytechnic amalgamation.

The tenth sub-sector comprises a single institution, the Open University which is exceptional in status and distinctive in its activities, distinguishable from the mainstream of British higher education with an organizational ethos and structure which since its inception has reflected the commitment to flexible, part-time study, particularly for mature students, and a commitment to the principles of lifelong learning.

The final two sub-sectors of universities consist of the old 'new' universities, or 'plateglass' universities [20], built on greenfield sites in the 1960s and the new 'new' universities, the former polytechnics promoted to university status in 1992. [21] These represent the main reform strategies adopted by higher education in which:

> ' The former embodied an extension, or modernisation of the university tradition; the latter an alternative to it '
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 47).

These twelve sub-sectors represent the expanded university sector. However, the higher education system incorporates a range of institutions outside the university sector. There are numerous ways to categorize the non-university institutions involved in higher education provision including geographical location or according to a matrix of generalist or specialist provision.

Scott (1995a) identifies a more elaborate and more informative typology which consists of four sub-groups. The first is the small group of multi-faculty colleges which aspire to

university status, such as Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education, Nene College, the Roehampton Institute and Bolton Institute of Higher Education. They are currently much larger in staff and student numbers than many of the universities of the early 1980s.

The second sub-group consists of the liberal arts colleges which originated from a teacher training background and includes, in itself, a diverse range of institutions of differing size, status and academic stature. The Church Colleges form part of this group and their origins, based on religious affiliation, have contributed to the development of a distinctive ethos emphasizing pastoral commitment and collegiality. The debate during the consultation process of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the threat to the use of the university college title, has led to the projection of a distinctive alternative future for this part of the sector with the (perhaps speculative) prospect of the establishment of one or more Church Universities (Lee, 1996).

The third group comprises the 'mixed economy' colleges offering further and higher education courses. Often large and found in urban settings, these institutions, such as Bradford and Ilkley Community College and Warrington Collegiate Institute, emphasize their community responsibilities to provide a continuum of educational opportunity at further and higher education level to students drawn principally from the locality.

The fourth category consists of the specialist colleges, often with national and international reputations, such as the Royal College of Music.

The final element of the higher education system consists of the further education institutions providing higher education courses and which receive funding directly from HEFCE (the third category above is a sub-set of this group). In 1998-99 the full-time Maximum Aggregated Student Number (MASN) for higher education courses in further education was 26,328 from a total higher education MASN of 743,152 (HEFCE, 1999). In total in 1996/97 there were 144,662 students on higher education courses in further education colleges in England, representing over 9% of all higher education students (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 1998). This category of higher education in further education is, therefore, a significant element of the higher education system.

To these seventeen categories, Scott adds the final aspects of post-compulsory education: further education; adult education; and the 'corporate classroom', each of which can be sub-divided many times.

Model Two, then, offers a complex structural and organisational map of higher education in Britain whose significance rests in the extent and the rate of change which is evident from the comparisons with *Model One* from the Robbins era.

These models, and the substantially different classifications of the structure of the higher education sector which they represent, derived from historical perspectives separated by only three decades, suggest an increasing level of fluidity and complexity in the structure and shape of higher education, characterized by rapid change. In this context, whilst it

appears from the content of the Report of the Robbins Committee and, particularly, that of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education under Sir Ron Dearing, that the pace and range of the changes affecting the demand for higher education and training was recognized in both instances, in neither, arguably, did this recognition translate itself into recommendations for major structural reform. This is an important theme which is explored more fully in Chapter 4.

3.6   Institutional Development

While this historical perspective is illuminating in a number of important respects, it is beyond the scope of this study to attempt to provide a comprehensive historical account of the development of the university sector as it is categorized above, which in any event would represent unnecessary duplication of work undertaken by others. (22)   However, in order both to establish the *ad hoc* nature of institutional development and to provide the basis for the direct comparative analysis in the context of the contemporary case study in Chapter 6 of the thesis, it is necessary to examine the historical development of those institutions which, from their foundation, bore the self-attributed designation university college and which developed, often rapidly and at times contentiously, to become universities with charter powers - essentially the civic universities. This will serve to demonstrate the importance of historical precedent as a basis of the sense of injustice which pervades the arguments of the university colleges whose use of the designation is prohibited by the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998.

This analysis, for comparative purposes with the current position set out in Chapters 4 and 5, will also highlight a number of features (at both sector and institutional level) of the development of universities since the end of the nineteenth century, namely, the extent to which the successful establishment and growth of many universities has been dependent on the significance of the role of notable individuals associated with particular institutions, exercising political influence in 'championing' the cause of particular educational organizations; the nature of the political and social campaigns waged to support the establishment or development of institutions; the significance of the strengthening sense of community which has been significant in justifying the case for recognition of, or changes to, institutional status; the significance, historically and, perhaps currently, of the funding base and the general resourcing of institutions as determinants of their suitability for university (or university college) status; and the complex and discrepant elements which comprise the university college sector (if, indeed *sector* is an appropriate term). This will enable the analysis of the map of the sector in Chapter 5 and particularly the essential features of the case study of a single institution in Chapter 6 to be placed in a clear historical perspective and, by implication, to enable the respective merits of arguments for the recognition of changing institutional status to be assessed.

This historical account will necessarily set aside from the preceding classifications, the examples of Oxford and Cambridge as collegiate structures, medieval in origin and based on the continental model of the *studium generale* such as those in Paris (philosophy and theology), Bologna (law), Salerno (medicine), and subsequently in Azerro, Padua and Naples (de Ridder-Symoens, 1992), and will also exclude the ancient universities in

Scotland whose purpose and course of development, funding and patronage are equally distinctive products of their ecclesiastical origins. The 'plateglass' universities created in the 1960s, were, unlike their predecessors, supported from the time of their establishment by the State, with government finance for capital and recurrent expenditure and were granted charter powers from their inception. These institutions, therefore, had not been involved in historical debates regarding appropriate titles or status. Although such considerations were of some significance in the incorporation of the Polytechnic sector in April 1989 and in 1992 on the attainment of university status for this group, none had direct origins in the university college sector.

These exclusions noted, given its central role in the birth of the Victorian civic universities, such an analysis of the development and growth of university colleges must begin with reference to the University of London.

3.6.1 The University of London

The influence and determination of individuals with a vision, complex governance arising from the lack of clear and effective administrative arrangements in a highly politicized environment, and the politics of institutional aspiration are no better exemplified than in the origins and development of the University of London.

The movement to create a university in London was initiated by Thomas Campbell in a letter to the Times on 9 February 1825 proposing an institution in London which would

provide a broad and wholly non-sectarian education in arts, science and medicine. Support came from a

> '....group of influential dissenters, Whigs and Radicals which included Francis Place, Jeremy Bentham, Dr. Birkbeck, Henry Brougham and Joseph Hume'
>
> (Thomas, 1973: 17).

Opened in 1827, the secular constitution was significant in that it generated considerable opposition from those who believed that religion was the basis of all stages of education and who regarded the new university as a '....godless institution....' to the extent that the Rector of Lambeth proposed the establishment of a rival institution in which

> '....it shall be an essential part of the system to imbue the minds of youth with a knowledge of the doctrines and duties of Christianity as inculcated by the United Church of England and Ireland.'
>
> (Thomas 1973: 18).

This rival institution, supported by George IV, consequently received the name King's College, and was granted a royal charter in 1829 and opened in 1831. In 1836 in response to the agitation of both institutions for degree-awarding powers and in order to prevent the multiplication of small universities, a third institution was established by royal charter. The University of London was created with power to hold examinations and grant degrees in arts, law and medicine, and simultaneously the original college which bore the name 'University of London' was re-named University College, and the two Colleges - University and King's - were confined to the teaching function. Originally the institutions were funded from private sources and significantly, the merger was supported by the first national grant to an English university (Allington and O'Shaughnessy, 1992). The charter of 1836 made provision for other colleges to be allowed to submit candidates for the

90

University examinations and by 1850 the number of arts colleges affiliated to the University had risen to nearly fifty and the affiliated medical schools approached one hundred. The charter of 1858 created an institution which existed only to examine and confer degrees, *'....a collegium or Board of Examiners....'* (Matthew Arnold in Thomas, 1973: 20). The attempt to create a rational structure from these developments, a problem described as *'....the most complex that has ever presented itself in academic history....'* (Thomas, 1973: 20), led to an unsuccessful attempt by University and King's College to form a new teaching university, proposed as Gresham university. Subsequently, the Colleges were eventually incorporated in the University, in 1907 and 1910 respectively. Not so with the 24 institutions of various types which had been designated as 'schools' of the University under the University of London Act in 1898. These included the London teaching hospitals, a number of theological colleges, the London School of Economics and women's colleges such as Bedford and the Royal Holloway College. By the 1970s, the University had three distinct types of institutions as constituent parts of the whole: University Institutes dealing with specialised, mainly postgraduate work; the Schools of the University which provided the bulk of the teaching; and various institutions such as the Royal College of Music where the University has 'recognised teachers' but no other links. (23) However, there were

> *'.....jarring discords in the great examination machine misnamed the University of London. Matthew Arnold, Walter Bagehot and Lyon Playfair, each so different in outlook, all agreed on the utter inadequacy of the London system to solve the problem of wide education in a mixed society.'*

> (Armytage, 1955: 236).

These 'jarring discords' combined with educational, social and civic aspiration led to the progressive dispersal of educational opportunity, a process which has continued for more than a century.

The complexities of the University of London model remain, and are reflected in the issues raised in Chapter 5 of the thesis relating to the inconsistencies of structure and terminology which clearly have their origins in the form of its establishment and early operation and which continue to confound attempts even to describe accurately and completely uniformly, less still to create a rational structure within the overall map of the higher education sector.

3.6.2   The Older Civic Universities

The older civic universities owe their existence to a combination of liberal benefactors and provincial rivalry (Allington and O'Shaughnessy, 1992).   Referring to seven universities- Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, Bristol and Reading (this categorisation differs from that used by Robbins in that it excludes Durham but includes Reading) - Robertson maintains that each of these provincial capitals had its individual provincial ethos, civic pride and tradition and men of wealth to whom a 'local' civic institution could make a 'patriotic' appeal.   Most significantly, he states

> *'In all,   the creation of the university has been preceded for at least a generation by the foundation of a university college'*

> (Robertson, 1944: 35).

Examples of this provincial ambition, individual vision and private financial support are amply evident in accounts of the development of these institutions, (24) as are references to the original designations. These institutions bore

> *'....little resemblance to universities as they were then known .... founded on shoestring budgets, for assorted reasons and various purposes'*

<div align="right">(Jones, 1988: 1).</div>

The establishment of civic universities in every provincial city was predated by the medical schools and Mechanics' Institutes: the former to provide medical education outside London or Scotland; the latter being the earliest attempt to respond to the new demands of the scientific age. The 'University College Movement' originated with the Owens College in Manchester in 1851 to provide primarily, though not exclusively, science education and, having overcome early difficulties (Robertson, 1944), absorbed the Medical School of Manchester in 1872. At that stage students read for University of London external degrees. The formation of the Owens College itself, its early development and the controversial establishment of the Victoria University, Manchester is definitively recounted in Thompson (1886) in which he captures the reality of establishing an institution of higher learning in an unfamiliar context. (25) Armytage comments on the difficulties facing these institutions in the 1860s, suggesting that

> *'The very muteness of the existing civic colleges at this time was an index of the trouble. London was declining in numbers. Durham had seriously considered closing. Queen's College, Birmingham was in debt for £10,000 and its charter was repealed in 1867. Owens College, Manchester, was fighting against half-hearted sympathy and openly expressed contempt'*

<div align="right">(Armytage, 1955: 220).</div>

Despite this, the federal Victoria University was established in 1880 with the power to confer degrees and included the University Colleges of Liverpool and Leeds as constituent members. The demand for scientific and technical education had led to the establishment of the Yorkshire College of Science in 1874 [26] and private benefaction and the generosity of Liverpool Corporation had led to the foundation of University College, Liverpool in 1881. Prompted by the plans for the nascent University of Birmingham and an innate provincial rivalry which had characterised the original federation, the issue of independent university status for the constituent colleges of the federation remained a feature of its early history. Each college had a different view of the desirability of such developments which provided a complex political and constitutional background (Fiddes, 1937) which was ultimately resolved in the establishment of three independent universities in Manchester and Liverpool in 1903 and in Leeds in 1904. As Fiddes maintains

> '....henceforth no one could count on the permanence of a federal
> institution.'
>
> (Fiddes, 1937: 105).

In Sheffield the position resembled the origins of Owens College where Mark Firth, an engineer and industrialist, endowed a college in 1879 as a focus for the Cambridge University Extension Movement which, eighteen years later merged with the Sheffield Medical School to form University College, Sheffield. The application from the University College to join the federation of the Victoria University was rejected amid considerable strength of feeling [27] on the grounds of: inadequate staffing; the lack of facilities in the medical School; inadequate premises; and insufficient financial support. The ambition of University College Sheffield to attain university status was crystallised by

the resolution of the Court of the Victoria University in January 1902 to dissolve the federation. While the authorities of the Yorkshire College opposed the dissolution of the federation (28) and, indeed, when persuasion failed, opposed the application of Manchester and Liverpool to the Privy Council for separate University Charters (Chapman, 1955), University College Sheffield recognised the significance of the published proposal to found a Yorkshire University and entered into discussions with Yorkshire College, Leeds and separately petitioned the Privy Council to recognise its aspirations and claim to university status. The extent of the provincial rivalry was evident to the extent that Sheffield was determined that the title 'Yorkshire University' would never describe an institution which did not include Sheffield. (29)

The campaign for university status for University College Sheffield, in common with other institutions of the period, was crucially dependent on the availability of funds to assure the Privy Council of its fitness to undertake and maintain the work of a university. The funds (£130,000 by April 1905) were largely derived from public appeal and, following pledges of financial support from numerous county councils and borough councils, the Privy Council signified its preparedness to recommend the granting of a Charter incorporating a University in Sheffield. As Sherborne maintains:

> *'The story of each university and college bears its own mark of individuality, expressed perhaps by the needs of a particular region or locality, the pragmatic impulse of a self-made man (sic), or a vision of idealism. Yet at the same time the growth in higher education was the response to a national need, and institutions learned from and emulated their peers. Underlying the unique attributes of each there is much common ground , and an unfolding pattern of development can be discerned'*
>
> (Sherborne, 1976: 1).

95

This view provides clear illustration of the significance of vision, individual influence and the importance of the availability of private funds in determining the success and pace of development of these institutions. The issue of funding was a particularly crucial concern reflecting the status which private philanthropy carried and the relationship between the state and education. (30) Jones comments on the rarity of support by government subvention in the broader acceptance of some degree of responsibility for social problems, national concerns, or public works and concludes:

> '.... this is best understood by remembering the constitutional reluctance of the Victorian state to expand its regulatory role.... (and)....many forms of government expenditure. The gospel of self-help, the doctrine of laissez faire....was worshipped by the state....The most that new universities could hope for until the closing years of the 19th century was tolerance, permission to incorporate, and eventually charters. Money they could not expect'
>
> (Jones, 1988: 34).

In referring to the origins of University College Sheffield, Chapman (1955) comments that several colleges survived in large measure due to the energetic commitment of a small group (which included William Ramsay and William Hicks, the Principal of University College Sheffield, who became the first Vice Chancellor of the University of Sheffield) in obtaining a government grant for English university colleges. (31)

Chapman (1955) argues in a detailed account of the political pressure exerted by a range of interest groups and individuals that it would be difficult to exaggerate the impact of the successful outcome of a long campaign to establish the principle of state aid to the English University Colleges. The Treasury grant (of £14,500) made to the ten English Colleges in 1889 as a result of extensive and concerted lobbying was accompanied by agreement that

the Treasury would appoint a person, experienced and fully conversant with the nature and needs of university life and representing the Government, who would visit each college periodically to inspect the buildings and laboratories and to become acquainted with the courses of study. This, in embryo, was the idea that was to grow into the University Grants Committee,

> '....that remarkable body that....(served)....so well to interpret the needs of the universities to the government and the needs of the nation to the universities....'
>
> (Chapman, 1955: 67).

The Mason Science College had been endowed in Birmingham in 1880, again supported by a strong civic pride and ambition. Strictly secular, the College was intended to provide purely scientific and technological education. Indeed, literary education and theology were excluded from its Foundation deed. (32) The development of the College was particularly influenced and directed by Joseph Chamberlain. As its President in 1898, he determined that the institution would attain the status of a civic university. The decision was taken not to apply for affiliation to the Victoria University Manchester but to found a separate university in Birmingham. The substantial financial support provided by Josiah Mason, a founding gift of unprecedented scale amounting to £200,000, enabled the college to achieve a size and stature which made it the first independent civic university within twenty years of its establishment and, granted its Charter in March 1900, the first provincial university to bear the title of a particular city.

The earliest impulse towards the foundation of a Bristol college emerged from the funding crisis experienced by the Bristol Medical School (founded in 1833) which in 1873 led to a

proposal to collaborate with the Museum and Library Society to form a Technical College of Science to strengthen the economic position of the city and to reduce the gap in technological education between Britain and other Western European countries which Sherborne maintains had introduced an

> *'An icy blast of industrial and commercial competitiveness, undermining the benefits of Britain's undisputed pre-eminence....'*
>
> (Sherborne, 1976: 2).

The establishment and eventual successful development of University College Bristol is widely attributed to John Percival, headmaster of Clifton College, and Lewis Fry, supported by a distinguished group of predominantly local enthusiasts and, notably, by Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol, an ardent advocate of the university extension system. Successive early failures to secure sufficient funds to provide a secure basis for the foundation of the new college failed to dampen the enthusiasm and commitment of its proponents and in October 1876 University College Bristol was established. The initial years were characterized by the abiding experience of financial constraint, a situation which was considerably relieved in 1889 with the granting of state aid to university colleges, and its progress was considerably retarded by local institutional rivalry and conflict with the Society of Merchant Venturers. (33)

In the period from its inception to 1897, in part due to the absence of significant secondary education in the city, the College had produced less than one hundred graduates of the University of London but this did not prevent the mutually reinforcing factors of growth in funding and in academic maturity contributing to the building of institutional confidence

leading to the fulfilment of its ambition for university status. In paying tribute to the

individual commitment and energies of those involved, Sherborne maintains that

> *'Looking back, the historian gives thanks for men [sic] such as these. It*
> *would be implausible to argue that University College Bristol ever wore a*
> *mantle of greatness....Great institutions regularly begin humbly and with*
> *little or no recognition'*

(Sherborne, 1976: 12).

In a commentary referring to University College, Bristol but whose sentiments could serve

for most, if not all of the histories of university colleges, Cottle (1951) emphasizes the

enduring influence and dedication of the group which met in the Victoria Rooms in Bristol

in June 1874 suggesting that

> *'If we look back on these shaping years, we can share the excitement of the*
> *few privileged men and women who knew they were beginning a tradition;*
> *and who had a humble but stirring sense of opportunity'*
>
> (Cottle, 1951: 15).

3.6.3   The Younger Civic Universities

The development of these institutions, although established in the twentieth century,

followed an essentially similar pattern to the older civic universities.

In the case of University College, Reading, the fulfilment of the university aspirations of

the institution, expressed as early as 1906, and inevitably delayed by the First World War,

was pursued by means of a concerted and lengthy campaign, led by the College principal,

W.M. Childs, which commenced in earnest in 1920 with the publication of a pamphlet [34]

in support of a petition for university status which contained a comprehensive account of the work of the College

> '... packed with every fact and every argument that our corporate industry and ingenuity could assemble.'
>
> (Childs, 1933: 232).

The University Grants Committee in a report presented to Parliament (35) proposed that the three University Colleges (Reading, Nottingham and Southampton) whose dependence upon the external examinations of the University of London was commiserated and condemned (Childs, 1933) should become attached to a 'patron university' which, its authors believed, would materially advance the standard of training provided by the university colleges and regularize their position as an '..intermediate grade of university....' (Childs, 1933: 240). This proposal was comprehensively rejected by University College Reading and in August 1921 the application for the granting of a charter was refused although the nature of the refusal encouraged the belief that the case had been proven if not yet won. (36)

The decision was taken on the basis of the encouraging tone of the Privy Council letter to redouble the efforts to secure a university charter and to respond to the conditions established for the reconsideration of the application as they related to the necessary increase in student numbers and annual income. In January 1925, following extensive development of the estate, library resources and the research base of the College, a further application was made which resulted in the granting of a charter formally notified by the Privy Council in May 1925. Confirming the significant role of a small number of colleagues, Childs (1933), in contrast to the experience of the dissolution of the Victoria

federation some decades previously and perhaps indicative of the increasing recognition of the legitimacy of the claims for university status from a wide range of potential sources, comments that

> *'Some persons might conjecture that no aspirant to university honours could hope to escape an ordeal of cold looks and doubtful greetings from those already within the charmed circle of chartered universities. That has not been our experience....In no instance have we had to encounter opposition or cavil. In many instances, the heads of universities and university colleges have been ready to endorse our claims, and to encourage us to persevere'*
>
> (Childs, 1933: 266).

The continuing theme of struggle and the influence and determination of individuals in these chequered institutional histories is evident in the case of University College Nottingham which

> *'....after nearly seventy years of....effort and hope, disappointment and frustration, won its way to full recognition and became the modern University....a monument to the....several generations of men and women... who shared the same vision and were resolved to pursue it to the end.'*
>
> (Wood, 1953: 3).

The developments from the earliest years of the Mechanics' Institute confirm a history characterized by vision and aspiration constantly overcoming uncertainty, apathy and occasionally, outright opposition. The fragility of the University of London external system and an increasing civic consciousness and sense of regional competition was exemplified by the political complexity of federation with Leicester in a University of the East Midlands, a prospect which ultimately receded. The example of the Victoria University federation which had dissolved within twenty years of its foundation demonstrated the difficulty of subsuming competing civic pride and aspirations under a

single banner. The failure of the proposed federation of University College Nottingham with Leicester was regarded as

> '....a lucky escape. Attractive though the idea was on paper, the
> association of a large, mixed jumble of colleges and technical schools could
> have resulted only in a ponderous and ramshackle institution, complex in its
> organisation and probably indifferent in its standards of work'
> (Wood, 1953: 89).

In a series of complex and highly politicized developments prior to the Second World War, University College Nottingham responded to pressure from the University Grants Committee to widen the base of college government, a lengthy and fraught political struggle (Wood 1953), and in 1938 secured a deed of emancipation (though not full university status since, relative to Reading for example, the College was deficient in endowment). In the immediate post-war period University College, Nottingham expanded rapidly and became the largest of the university colleges in the country. The developments to the estate and to the funding base, together with the resolution of the issue of constitution giving representation to various local authorities, led to the award of its charter in August 1948, the '....triumphant response to seventy years of hope and effort.....' (Wood, 1953: 154).

Between the incorporation of Reading in 1926 and Nottingham in 1948 no further universities were created and no university colleges were admitted to the Treasury list until Hull and Leicester in 1945. Indeed there were no exact criteria to assess whether institutions merited progression from university college to university status although the standards set by the committee on Treasury grants and later the University Grants Committee became more rigorous particularly in the realm of student numbers and

institutional finances.   In the case of Exeter, which had achieved university college status

in 1922, the future requirements were clear:

> '....*stronger finances, new and worthy buildings, a larger and better qualified body of students, a growing academic reputation based in part upon the examination successes and subsequent careers of the students, but principally upon the contributions of the academic staff to the advancement of learning.'*
>
> (Clapp, 1982: 102).

University College of the South West of England was exceptional among university

colleges in the narrow range of subjects taught, being essentially a two-faculty institution,

arts and natural sciences, again under the *aegis* of the University of London.   In the inter-

war years the prospect of a south-west federation was raised and rapidly disappeared (37)

which made the attainment of university status and its own charter more unlikely.   The

unfavourable view of the principal of the College when he joined the institution in 1926, is

notable:

> '*The College was quite unfit, in my opinion to give degrees in 1922, and for years after. I took it on in 1926 and had a sharp disillusionment and all but threw it up.   What they did not deserve then, they do now'*
>
> (Murray in Clapp, 1982: 110).

Within eight years of taking up office he was consulting with the UGC with regard to

charter status.   The post-war period witnessed the significant expansion of student

recruitment although the (now almost traditional) reservations regarding the lack of

endowments and library provision were eased by the more generous provision of

government funds.   However, in the application for a charter the lack of recent precedent

made the process somewhat obscure and Murray did not benefit from the support of other

institutions in quite the way described by Childs (1933) at Reading. On the contrary, Clapp suggests that

> *'Reading appeared to have forgotten how twenty years before it had set about the business and neither Nottingham nor Southampton threw any light on the subject. Whether this was from ignorance or prudence is not clear; both had the same ambitions as Exeter, and both had achieved university status before Exeter despite their professed innocence of the correct procedure'*

(Clapp 1982: 111).

Despite having condemned the federal concept a decade earlier, Murray, through a large and powerful deputation, presented a federal proposal to the University Grants Committee which was flatly rejected. The tone of the rejection was in marked contrast to the encouragement given to University College, Reading in its initial failure, pronouncing that

> *'The Committee do [sic] not consider that these plans are either desirable or possible even in a remote future'*
>
> (Clapp, 1982: 112).

Interestingly, while the Committee was not satisfied that the academic staff of the College were of the distinction and quality required of an institution of full university status, a not wholly different academic staff was considered appropriate a mere eight years later, with the possible interpretation that that persistence and the perceptions of the suitability of the institution to be admitted to the university sector weighed more heavily than demonstrable fulfilment of explicit criteria. The evidence of the case study in Chapter 6 shows that the concept of 'appropriateness' (in the case of University College Warrington expressed as 'academic standing') is clearly an issue which remains important.

The apparent greater level of difficulty which Exeter was facing in attaining university status may be attributable to the faster growth being experienced in the university colleges of Nottingham, Southampton and Hull and the innate reluctance of the University Grants Committee to recommend the granting of charters to too many institutions in the period. Nottingham had received its charter in 1948; Southampton in 1952; and Hull in 1954. It was suggested that

> 'In a country where change proceeded at a decent measured pace, Exeter's turn would come.'
>
> (Clapp, 1982: 113).

Indeed, this was the case. During 1953-54, a second, more measured submission, eschewing the politics of confrontation, was prepared, submitted in January 1955, and duly approved in October of that year.

3.7   Summary and Conclusions

The foregoing analysis has been based on an exploration of the progressive development of the structure of higher education; not a *system* but, rather, a piecemeal collection of institutions whose development has been characterized by individuality, philanthropy and the significance of institutional context, history and aspiration in the midst of attempts to rationalize the disparate elements into a common framework. This analysis has focused on a range of institutions whose historical origins make their development (and consequently their current position) relevant to the issue of university college title.

In the context of this strand of the central thesis, this historical perspective clarifies a number of significant issues and rectifies several misconceptions relating to the development of the university colleges and the universities.

First, it shows that the civic universities which, in the 1990s, preserve and promote the international reputation of British higher education and, indeed, now form an integral part of what Trow refers to as the

> '....network of attitudes, values....(which)....defines more clearly than anywhere else in the world....the concept of elite higher education'
>
> (Trow, 1989: 61)

have been created largely on an *ad hoc* and often *ad hominem* basis and have prospered as a result of: individual influence, vision, struggle and determination, private initiative and often private funding; influential local opinion supported by strong local authorities and regional (and national) interest; a commitment to educational experimentation; and a response to the need for diversification and growth exercised over a prolonged period – many of the characteristics which are used currently to legitimize the claims of institutions for recognition of their entitlement to the university college designation.

Secondly, and related to this, the historical analysis raises questions relating to the concept of a *system* of higher education. The term implies a rational structure based on widely accepted priorities, of long-standing, clearly established, whose development and refinement reflected the consistent application of largely unchanging criteria leading to a uniform sector with a rational and justifiable status differentiation, exhibiting a consonance

of view and a constancy of purpose. On the contrary, even in the post-war period Simon

(1946) was able to argue that

> 'There is no university 'system' in Britain. There are 16 self-governing
> universities, each of which has developed in its own way, Oxford and
> Cambridge, the federal universities of London and Wales, and the regional
> universities in the provincial cities.'
>
> (Simon, 1946: 79).

References to a higher education *system*, subject to rational, systematic development and

consistent responses to policy change are, therefore, questionable in the light of this

historical perspective.

Thirdly, the view that the standing of the higher education system rests on the protected

status of a group of institutions with distant origins and traditions which, almost mystically,

preserve the reputation of British higher education, clearly ignores this historical

perspective in several important respects.

The opposition to fundamental structural reform (and the consequent re-ordering of the

status hierarchy which it has implied) has been based on some institutions' view of the

'rightfulness' of their place in the 'traditional and long-established' structure of British

higher education. However, this analysis shows that such a view belies the reality of the

historical development of higher education. At the outset a plausible hypothesis might

have suggested that such a position was justifiable, offering a picture of an embattled

university sector, in crisis (Scott, 1984), having witnessed the progressive erosion of its

authority, credibility and influence and which was, in consequence, resistant to further

change. The analysis shows, however, that the basis on which this position rests is (somewhat ironically) ahistorical and misconceived. Nonetheless, the misconception has been sustained by sufficient strength of argument to restrict institutional development (both universities and university colleges) demonstrating clearly that, although based on a flawed historical analysis, issues of status and power have provided substantial, continuing barriers to the fulfilment of institutional (and, often community and educational) aspiration.

The preceding analysis shows that universities are thoroughly modern institutions in perhaps all but the most important sense, that is in their ability (or willingness) to respond to change. Public policy intervention in the management of the university sector was entirely absent until the mid-nineteenth century when the number of universities had risen only to fourteen. At the time of the Robbins Committee twenty-four universities existed with a series of six 'new' universities in the process of formation with a total population of less than 120,000 students with 15% of that number attending Oxford and Cambridge. Three-quarters of Britain's universities have been created during the past three decades. This chronology is significant in that it demonstrates that:

> '....even if anterior institutions are taken into account, few
> universities can trace their origins back beyond the mid-nineteenth
> century. Almost everything about higher education - system,
> institutions and students - is new'.
>
> (Scott, 1995a: 11).

The claim to privilege and status based on history, tradition and longevity is falsified by a clearer analysis of the sequence of institutional and sector development. It is evident that the 'old' universities did not pre-date the 'new' universities in quite the manner used to

justify the claims. The 'old' (pre-1992) university sector is substantially a post-Robbins development despite the impact on the perceptions of its age and *gravitas* of the presence of Oxford, Cambridge and the Victorian civics in this group. Much of the development of the 'old' universities occurred after 1960 and many of these institutions, the 'plateglass' universities and the technological universities have no pre-Robbins history, the former of any description, or the latter as universities (Scott, 1995a).

At the same time the development of the former Polytechnic sector was rapid and substantial, transformed from narrowly vocational institutions reflecting their (often distant) origins, into comprehensive universities, moving from municipal dependence (pre-1988) to corporate independence and full university status and in the process leading curriculum innovation and pioneering new patterns of course structure and delivery from the secure base of the Council for National Academic Awards throughout the 1970s and 1980s (Pratt, 1997).

The significance of these developments is that they were occurring almost *simultaneously*. The 'old' universities gained impetus from the Robbins Report, the Polytechnic sector was created (perhaps indirectly) as a result of it. These parallel sets of changes were in response to similar sets of political, socio-economic, scientific and technological forces. This analysis questions the validity and justification of an elitism based on privilege which flows naturally from history, birthright and tradition.

Fourthly, this historical perspective highlights the misconception of the character of the higher education sector created by the misleading emphasis on 'binarism' as the defining feature of the pre-1992 higher education sector. The perceptions of the shape of the sector were dominated and to some extent distorted by the existence of the binary divide which, as the most obvious distinguishing feature, obscured a series of fault-lines and cross-cutting binary demarcations which became progressively more apparent in the post-Robbins era. It is evident that the current sector is defined by its pluralism and diversity (38) reflecting its origins, factors readily acknowledged by the Dearing Inquiry but whose implications were largely ignored, as will be demonstrated in Chapter 4.

Finally, and most significantly, this analysis illustrates the unpredictable, unplanned and uncharted path to maturity which has characterized the development of civic universities in the structure of British higher education, a history which questions the motives and perceptions of those institutions and individuals, who, having achieved appropriate recognition and status within the sector, have sought over several decades, and in the face of intensifying pressure to expand, continue to deny to existing non-university providers of higher education the opportunity to fulfil the collective ambitions of the individuals and institutions involved and the communities they serve. (39)

The detailed historical analysis in this chapter has shown clearly the nature and form of the unstructured and unsystematic development of a wide range of university institutions over the last century. It has confirmed the politicized context in which institutional and sector development has been set and the perpetual sense of struggle and resistance which has

110

dominated the progress towards the fulfilment of institutional ambition and aspiration to achieve appropriate recognition and status as providers of higher education. This analysis provides an essential backdrop to the context and outcomes of the two major committees of inquiry into higher education which have been established in the last thirty years and their respective and comparative examinations and pronouncements on the issue of the shape and structure of higher education, particularly as it relates to the role and status of University Colleges. The historical context is essential to an understanding of the contemporary debate since it provides an explanation of the constraints and pre-conditions which current policy analysts and policy-makers face in attempting to impose a rational, structured foundation for the future development of the higher education sector. The historical analysis demonstrates clearly that the status and reputational considerations on which the success of British higher education is founded and which have been so influential in determining the successful growth of the university sector, although misconceived, exaggerated and, in some instances, entirely false, remain significant in determining the sector's approach to structural change. Such considerations, however ill-founded, have precluded a clear prescription for the future structural development of higher education sought by the Robbins Committee in the 1960s and by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in the 1990s.

Notes

1. *Report of the Committee on Higher Education* (1963) Cmnd. 2154. London: HMSO.

2. The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society.* London: HMSO. Chaired by Sir Ron Dearing, the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education was established to examine the shape, structure and funding of higher education.

3.   As an entirely mechanistic definition, an elite system is said to be one which enrols up to 15% of the age participation index; a mass system between 15% and 40%; and a universal system over 40%. M. Trow (1974) *Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education* Berkeley, CA : Carnegie (Commission on Higher Education) Elsewhere, Trow (1989) reaffirms this view and argues that there is a:

> '....*network of attitudes, values and institutions ....(which)....defines more clearly than anywhere else in the world, certainly on a national basis, the concept of elite higher education, that is, the provision of a high and demanding post-secondary education to an academically selective and relatively small proportion of the university aged cohort - a proportion that in my view cannot greatly exceed roughly 15 per cent of the age grade without engendering severe stress in the system'*

<div align="right">(Trow, 1989: 61).</div>

4.   The Further and Higher Education Act (1992) granted university status to the former Polytechnics, thus ending the 'binary divide' between independent universities and the former public sector higher education institutions.

5.   The concepts of institutional status and structural reform are interrelated. The notion of institutional status has a number of sub-texts. In this context the concept refers specifically to the ambition and aspiration which many institutions have expressed throughout the history of British higher education (see Chapter 3) to assume independent responsibility for the management, resourcing and delivery of the highest possible level of education and training which the institution can sustain, and for which there is demonstrable demand in response to the economic, social and educational needs of the local and regional community.

The term structural reform refers here to the re-organisation of the structure of higher education to enable all institutional providers, whether higher or further education corporations, subject to the necessary accreditation or approval processes either from a university partner or from a national body such as the Quality Assurance Agency, to attain degree-awarding powers, to market their institutions and educational services and to utilize institutional titles in a manner which most effectively conveys the nature and level of education and training provided. Structural reform refers to a changed model (Trow, 1974; 1989) within which educational opportunities are offered to the widest possible audience rather than one which adopts an incremental approach to the existing structure and institutional form to protect and preserve (historically misconceived) institutional status. This latter approach continues to emphasize the role of higher education as preparing people for a place in a predetermined social and economic hierarchy rather than being responsible for the creation of a sustainable culture of aspiration and providing the inspiration for the democratic mass of society (Robertson 1997b), thus perpetuating

> '....*the cultural reinforcement of a selective and socially privileged segment of the population.'*

<div align="right">(Robertson, 1997b: 94).</div>

6.   Walford argues that the University Grants Committee originally enabled the universities to maintain a considerable degree of independence from government, even at a time when the majority of funding was directly from this source. He suggests that

> '*In the 1950s and early 1960s the British University Grants Committee was widely regarded as being an almost ideal arrangement for government support of universities and was copied by many other countries'*

<div align="right">(Walford, 1991; 167).</div>

7.   Ministry of Education (1956) *Technical Education.* Cmnd 9703. London: HMSO.

8. The binary structure following the establishment of the Polytechnics in the late 1960s, referred to the co-existence of independent universities, established by Royal Charter with the power to award degrees, and the new polytechnics, controlled by the local education authorities and which awarded degrees of the Council for National Academic Awards, the body established specifically for the purpose of ensuring the maintenance of appropriate, consistent standards in the work of these new institutions.

9. Scott has argued that

> 'In the larger transition from elite to mass higher education there is likely
> to be a shift from nation-wide horizontal integration to vertical integration,
> often in a regional context'

(Scott, 1995a: 21).

While this may be an accurate analysis in the longer term with the newly-established Regional Development Agencies playing a more active role in co-ordinating and influencing the relationship between higher education and the regional economies, the recommendations of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Government response to them, serve to reaffirm the divisions between further and higher education, a development which Scott refers to later in the same chapter, and which militates against the vertical integration of post-secondary provision.

10. The view was expressed by one College Principal that, having taken every available public and private opportunity to promote the cause of the Polytechnics for university status, the same group of former Polytechnic Directors provided the most vehement opposition to the proposed changes in status and title for some non-university higher education institutions. (Personal interview by the writer of this thesis with Dr. J. Cater, Principal, Edge Hill University College, 31 March, 1998)

11. Scott identifies seventeen categories of higher education providers. These were

i)	Oxford and Cambridge
ii)	The University of London
iii)	The Victorian Civic Universities
iv)	The Younger Civic Universities – The'Redbrick Universities '
v)	Durham and Keele
vi)	The technological Universities (Bath, Loughborough, Aston, Salford)
vii)	The Scottish Universities
viii)	The University of Wales and the University of Glamorgan
ix)	Queen's University, Belfast and Ulster University
x)	The Open University
xi)	The 'Plateglass' Universities
xii)	The 'new' universities (the former Polytechnics)
xiii)	Multi-Faculty Colleges aspiring to University status (Cheltenham and Gloucester; Nene College; Roehampton Institute and Bolton Institute of Higher Education
xiv)	Liberal Arts Colleges (including the Church Colleges)
xv)	'Mixed Economy' Further and Higher Education Colleges
xvi)	Specialist institutions (e.g. Royal College of Music)
xvii)	Further Education Institutions offering higher education courses

12. Numerous detailed accounts have been written of the development of the institutions comprising the federation often as part of centenary or sesquicentenary celebrations, in particular C.D. Burns (1924) *A Short History of Birkbeck College*. London: University of London; S. Caine (Sir) (1963) *The*

113

History of the Foundation of the London School of Economics and Political Science. London: Bell; H. Hale Bellot (1929) *University College London (1826-1926).* London: University of London Press; and G. Huelin (1978) *King's College London 1828-1978* London, University of London. Such accounts consistently provide evidence of the extent to which institutional development was dependent on individual initiative in responding to the perceived social, economic and cultural needs of the community, the crucial importance of securing funding support, and in some cases the need to overcome political opposition.

In the case of the London School of Economics and Political Science for example, F.A. Hayek in 'The London School of Economics 1895-1945' (*Economica*, February 1946) commented that

> *'In the early nineties the unsatisfactory state of university education in London had begun to attract serious attention. As this coincided with a strong revival of interest in economic and social problems, it was inevitable that the glaring deficiencies in this field should be especially felt. Here not only London, but also the older universities were badly off compared with universities of the Continent and the United States....The Commissioners appointed to consider the Draft Charter for the proposed Gresham University in London reported early in 1894....(were)... fully alive to the imperative and urgent need which exists for supplying this kind of education for the students of London University'*

(Hayek in Caine, 1963: 6-7).

Huelin, in describing the concern in London during the 1820s, commented that

> *'It was right and proper that the opportunities of higher education should be made available to those who for one reason or another were unable to enjoy the privilege hitherto exclusive to the ancient Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, both of which had been and were for many years to come the close preserve of the Church of England.'*

(Huelin, 1978: 1).

13.   The birth and early development of the Victorian civic universities provides a revealing commentary on the progressive failure of the federal system based around the University of London, as the federated institutions sought increasing independence in response to the demands of their respective communities and to accommodate the need to extend and develop the curriculum beyond the restrictions of the parent university.   Such a perspective is provided in the study of the origins of the civic universities and their social, economic and cultural context by D. R. Jones (1988) in *The Origins of Civic Universities: Manchester, Leeds and Liverpool.* London: Routledge.

14.   The more recently-established civic, or 'redbrick' universities, originally were also academically dependent on the University of London, offered a narrower range of subjects, and were concentrated in the Midlands and the South of England (Scott,1995a).

15.   An account of the early history of the University of Durham is provided by C.E. Whiting (1932) *The University of Durham 1832-1932.* London: Shieldon Press.

16.   A full account of the history and establishment of the University of Keele is provided by W.B. Gallie (1960) *A New University; A.D. Lindsay and the Keele Experiment.* London: Chatto and Windus.

17.   The Colleges of Advanced Technology provided a focus of attention at the time of the Robbins Committee and the pressures of the external environment and the perceptions of their role in meeting the needs of the economy in providing a highly skilled workforce led to rapid changes to status and title. These institutions were often formed from the amalgamation and rationalization of

114

a complex array of separate enterprises involved in different aspects of higher education, such as teacher education, colleges of art and design, and colleges of technology.

Loughborough, for example, which exhibited such complexity was officially designated as a College of Advance Technology in 1957, a status which it retained only until 1966 when, as a result of the Robbins Report, it became Loughborough University of Technology. L.M. Cantor and G.F. Matthews (1977) provide a comprehensive account of these changes in *Loughborough; From College to University* Loughborough: Loughborough University of Technology.

Similarly, Brunel had a short existence as a College of Advance Technology. Although nominally it continued as such until 1966, in the period from 1964 the College was fully engaged in the preparations for the transition to university status.(Topping, 1981).

18. The history of the University of Wales is regarded as the history of a nationalist movement seeking to express its distinctiveness. It was described as an idea

> *'....conceived, cherished and propagated by a few far seeing and intrepid spirits who carried the idea to its ultimate realisation through the enthusiasm and devotion of the people to whom they appealed. It is thus in a true sense the expression of a nation's will and in this respect occupies a unique position among modern universities'*
> (Morgan, 1928: 6).

Robertson endorses this view in suggesting that

> *'The University of Wales, created by Royal Charter in 1893, was the expression of a strong national movement, which....fought the double battle of satisfying Welsh national sentiment and the demand for higher education through a national and independent university'*
> (Robertson, 1944: 37).

19. D.T.W. Price (1990) in *A History of St. David's University College Lampeter Vol.2: 1898-1971.* Cardiff: University of Wales, captures the intensity of feeling in the long struggle for recognition of St. David's University College, Lampeter. In fact, during 1998 an amendment was approved to Article IV of the Charter of the University of Wales to re-designate St. David's University College as University of Wales, Lampeter. This was a special resolution made by the Court of the University of Wales at a meeting held on 17 April 1998 and submitted to the Privy Council approval under Article XXVI of the Supplemental Charter, as amending Article IV.

20. An account of the creation of the Universities of Sussex, York, East Anglia, Essex, Lancaster, Kent and Warwick is provided by Michael Beloff (1968) in *The Plateglass Universities* London: Secker and Warburg

21. An account of the creation and development of the polytechnics is provided in J. Pratt (1997) *The Polytechnic Experiment* Buckingham: SRHE/OUP

22. General accounts of the history and development of the British universities from a range of different perspectives have been provided by C. G. Robertson (1944) *The British Universities.* London: Methuen ; M. Beloff (1968) *The Plateglass Universities.* London: Secker and Warburg; H.J. Perkin (1969) *New Universities in the United Kingdom* Brussels: OECD; M. Sanderson (1972) *The Universities and British Industry 1850-1970.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul; D.J. Thomas (1973) *Universities.* London: Batsford; P. Venables (1978) *Higher Education Developments : The Technological Universities.* London: Faber and Faber; R.D. Anderson (1992) *Universities and Elites in Britain since 1800.* Hampshire: Macmillan; and W.H.G. Armytage (1955) *Civic Universities : aspects of a British tradition.* London: Ernest Benn.

23. The system of formal 'recognition' of staff involved in the delivery of degree programmes in institutions described as university colleges, continues. For example, at University College Warrington which offers a range of undergraduate programmes under the *aegis* of the University of Manchester, formal 'recognition' of the staff by means of approval of qualifications and experience upon appointment is required as an aspect of the quality assurance arrangements of the University.

24. A comprehensive and enlightening account of the social and economic conditions prevailing in the late Victorian era which gave impetus to the increasing demands for education and training and the formation of new institutions is provided by D. R. Jones (1988) in *The Origins of Civic Universities: Manchester, Leeds and Liverpool*. London: Routledge. This work highlights the new attitudes towards education, the nature of the industrial cities in which the demand was evident, and demonstrates the significance of the role of founders and benefactors in the development and success of the University College movement.

25. Thompson, in excessively romanticized terms, describes the history of Owens College as labouring under one great disadvantage:

> 'The College is no venerable institution founded in the mystical past by Anglo-Saxon king, by lordly prelate, or by haughty Tudor; it is the creation of a man in our midst and known to some of us. It has no delightful surroundings of sparkling river, trim greensward, noble elms, spreading cedars, or venerable yews: it was first located in a dreary and somewhat disreputable neighbourhood, and in its better conditions has to contend with blackening smoke, the noise of traffic, and an uncongenial climate. But no one who reads the history of the college can fail to notice how bravely it has faced its disadvantages and triumphed over them....'

(Thompson, 1886: ix).

26. The history of the development of the University of Leeds, the economic and social context, its particular technological focus and the battle for a broader conception of the College's purpose is provided by P. Gosden and A. J. Taylor (1975) in *Studies in the History of a University 1874-1974*. Leeds: Arnoldson, who quote William Byles in 1875 writing in the Bradford Observer:

> 'We hope that no one will be finally content....until the College of Science has grown into a great Yorkshire University'

(Byles in Gosden and Taylor, 1975: 6)

27. The politics of provincial rivalry involved in the issue of institutional status is no better exemplified by application of University College, Sheffield to join the federation of the Victoria University Manchester. Chapman (1955) provides a detailed account of the acrimony surrounding the rejection of the application. He comments

> '....if the rejection of the application may perhaps have been justified, nothing can excuse the apparently studied discourtesy with which it had been done. The University Council had considered and approved its report to the Court as early as 5 May ....(1898)....yet, no warning of its contents was given to any of the Sheffield officers....A document of the most damaging kind, criticising severely almost every aspect of the Sheffield College, was released to the nation in a blaze of publicity before even a formal letter of rejection had been sent to the College. It might almost be thought that the University was so anxious to prevent the entry of the College that it was trying to kill it outright'

(Chapman, 1955: 143)

Chapman goes on to suggest that Liverpool's written case for its withdrawal from the Victoria University in 1901 shows probably the true reason for Sheffield's failure to obtain admission in suggesting that

> 'To the objection that the abandonment of the federal system would check the growth of colleges in the great towns by depriving them of the prospect of admission to the federal university, the answer is simple. No one who knows by experience the conditions under which the Victoria University is now working will be inclined to admit the possibility of any fresh accessions. The machine is already over-strained ; the organisation is already cobrous and unwieldy'

(Chapman, 1955: 177).

28.   The Council of the Yorkshire College laid down its policy on University status thus

> 'The Council of the Yorkshire College....desire to express their opinion that the dissolution of the Victoria in favour of separate universities would be detrimental to the interests of education, but that should such a dissolution take place, the establishment of a University having its seat in Leeds would be essential'

(Chapman 1955: 178).

29.   The report of a speech given by Sir Henry Stephenson stated

> 'Come what may, we must be on an equality with Leeds....If Leeds was granted an independent, self-contained University, Sheffield claimed the same, and would never rest until the same privileges were granted'

(Sheffield Daily Independent, 19 May 1903)

30.   An excellent account of the changing nature of the relationship between the state and education in the late nineteenth century is provided by D.R. Jones (1988) *The Origins of Civic Universities ; Manchester, Leeds and Liverpool* London, Routledge in which he describes the growing sense of education as a public responsibility and a public service.

31.   A letter from Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol College Oxford set out the case for financial support by government subvention clearly asserting that

> '.....no new principle is involved. The governmen , in conceding the claim, would only be extending to England a boon which they have already granted to Wales, Ireland and Scotland. The Colonial Governments make liberal provision for their university and public schools and every civilised nation without exception contributes to the maintenance of higher as well as elementary education out of state funds. '

The letter continued:
> 'Ten such University Colleges already exist....Only three of them - Owens College, Manchester, Mason College, Birmingham, and University College, Liverpool - have any considerable endowment beyond their sites and buildings. The other provincial Colleges are either in debt or are insufficiently provided with professors and lecturers, and....have only the alternative of raising the fees to an amount which would be prohibitory to the majority of the students, or of diminishing the number and lowering the quality of the teachers - a measure which would fatally impair the teaching of the College. '

(The Times, 3 March, 1887).

It is interesting to draw the strong parallels between this expression of concern about the relationship between funding, quality, institutional development and growth with those which appeared in the pages of the Times Higher Education Supplement during the mid-1990s (Rhodes, 1996) as an aspect of the quality and standards debate and in the contributions to the consultation exercise during the proceedings of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. The language may be slightly different but the message is consistent.

32.   In examining the nature of the work of these early institutions, Jones (1988) points out that the original trust deed for Mason College Birmingham excluded literary and arts subjects. These were included only under the combined pressure of Josiah Mason's advisors and the requirements of London matriculation and degree examinations.

> 'Perhaps it is the fame of this testementary stipulation which has led to the peculiar notion
> that the new civic universities were founded primarily to teach science and technology
> ....Liverpool was powerfully oriented towards arts subjects by a local elite long accustomed
> to 'liberal' and classical education. In fact the least support was given to those
> institutions with the heaviest technological bias, like Leeds'
>
> (Jones, 1988: 18).

33.   The tension between the two organisations is well-documented in B. Cottle (1951) The Life of a University Bristol, the University of Bristol, in which he describes the mutual recriminations about encroachment in the curriculum and the 'dualism' which continued until the granting of the charter in May 1909.

34.   Entitled 'Statement of the Case for University Independence' and published in January 1920, the pamphlet enumerated with considerable resentment the objections to the continuation of the external degree system of the University of London suggesting that the system failed to reflect in the academic qualification of the graduate the predominant role of the College

> 'A Reading student who obtains a London degree goes out into the world with an
> academic qualification which excludes the name of the College where he was
> taught......the College which educated him for years is totally eclipsed by the
> University which spent a few days examining him. Dependence upon the external
> degrees of London is incompatible with the freedom of teaching which is due of a
> university institution , and the condition of its highest efficiency. If 'University
> College' means anything, it means an institution which endeavours to do the work
> of a university without the corollary and advantage of university independence '
>
> (in Childs, 1933: 234-235).

35.   Report of the University Grants Committee presented to Parliament. 3 February, 1921.

36.   The letter from the Clerk of the Privy Council stated that

> 'While Their Lordships feel that it would be premature to accede at the present
> stage to the application for a charter, they have been favourably impressed by
> certain features of the College organisation......and by the good work the
> institution is doing....and if the application is renewed when the College has
> increased its numbers, and raised its income to £80,000, they will be willing to
> reconsider this matter'
>
> (Letter from the Clerk of the Council, Privy
> Council. 22 August, 1921).

118

37. For many years Plymouth was the destined site for a faculty of engineering; Cambourne School of Mines for a faculty of mining engineering; and Seale-Hayne Agricultural College, a faculty of agriculture (Clapp 1982).

38. While diversity remains a defining characteristic of the higher education sector it is interesting to note that the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education saw this as threatened by the funding arrangements which were distorting institutional missions and producing a homogeneity across the sector as institutions responded to the need to secure their funding base by responding to the full range of funded initiatives to an extent which subordinated institutional strategic objectives to the need to maintain short term income levels (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. Para. 16.11, Recommendation 61: 252)   The Higher Education Funding Council for England in its response to the Dearing Report contradicted the conclusion of the National Committee, suggesting that:

> 'The English higher education system is one of the most diverse in the world and we believe it should remain so.   This rich variety reflects the differing needs of students and has been a source of excellence in many fields.   We will ensure that our funding arrangements continue to support diversity of institutional mission'
>
> (HEFCE, 1997: 7 Para.38).

39. It is particularly anomalous that this has occurred specifically at the point when the marketisation of education has encouraged higher education institutions to assume a competitive awareness, and to subject themselves to the scrutiny and rigours of the market, and where cost benefit analysis, value for money and institutional funding have displaced curriculum as the priority for managers in higher education.   At the same time some institutions have been (and continue to be) denied the opportunity to derive the market advantage which institutional title, in a sector whose history is founded upon status and reputation, can provide.   This contradiction is highlighted by Coffield and Williamson who maintain that

> 'Conservative ministers of education have had few inhibitions in centralising educational decision-making while simultaneously expressing their unashamed ideological commitment to the market....'
>
> (Williamson and Coffield, 1997: 117).

The constraints applied to the use of institutional title which have been formalized in the recommendations of Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education contrast starkly with the opportunities available to (now) well-established institutions freely to adopt the title university college during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries - periods when governments had a constitutional aversion to the expansion of the state's regulatory control and when

> '....the doctrine of laissez-faire was worshipped by the state and much of the articulate public'
>
> (Jones, 1988: 34).

It is an indication of the strength and depth of status considerations in British higher education that, during a period of almost two decades of Conservative Governments committed to the principles of the market and the concept of de-regulation, opportunities for status re-positioning in response to demand and the optimisation of competitive advantage on which effective markets depend have been denied to those non-university institutions which have been most committed and able to deliver the massive expansion of higher education which has been the central feature of government policy (both Conservative and Labour) since the mid-1980s.

The issue of status and its impact on institutions' reputational standing and ability to attract students is not a concern which has arisen out of recent changes in the structure of the sector.   The petition sent to the Privy Council on 15 July 1903 by University College Sheffield commented that

'....not being able to offer the practical reward of a degree the Sheffield University College has drawn comparatively few students from its natural feeders, the Secondary Schools....the experience of Birmingham, Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds might be adduced to show how profoundly the ability of an Institution to hall-mark its own students by giving them a University degree affects the numbers who come to it to take regular and systematic courses.'

(Chapman, 1955: 185-186).

CHAPTER 4

EXPANSION AND STRUCTURAL REFORM IN HIGHER EDUCATION: FROM ROBBINS TO DEARING

4.1   Introduction

The balancing of the need to respond to demands for increased participation and the over-riding concern to maintain the traditional value systems and structures of an elite system represents a discernible, consistent theme throughout the period since the 1960s and one which is demonstrable by an examination of the rationales, approaches, and outcomes of two major review bodies which, although separated by more than three decades, are bonded by the common problems of responding to (and to an extent advocating), the expansion of the system (relative to pre-existing numbers) and identifying an effective organizational structure for the management of higher education. This chapter will examine the perspectives, the approaches to the issue of the role and status of university colleges, and the outcomes of the two major reviews of the higher education sector within the last three decades, the Robbins Committee (1) and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education under Sir Ron (now Lord) Dearing (2) in order to assess the extent to which these reviews of the higher education system have responded to these conflicting pressures.

First, the analysis will demonstrate that the view of the two committees on the role and status of University Colleges was ahistorical, failing to recognize the significance of the

unsystematic and unstructured nature of the historical development of individual institutions and the sector as a whole. The strength of view emanating from this (misconceived and often misrepresented) historical position which maintained the parameters, constraints and pre-conditions for structural reform significantly affected the outcomes of the Committees of Inquiry. This failure to acknowledge the historical context and to respond to the inherited anomalies of title and status prevented the Committees of Inquiry from establishing the clear prescription for the development of the sector which their respective terms of reference sought. This enabled the historical view of institutional status and the need to preserve the existing hierarchies in the higher education 'system' to prevail over the pressure for widened access and increased participation, the evidence for which was presented by the Committees themselves. These represent important (lost) opportunities to reconcile the conflict between the pressures of economic, political, social, cultural and demographic changes which demand reform of the structure of higher education to accommodate continuing expansion of educational opportunity, and the maintenance of traditional value systems and structures of an elite system.

Second, the chapter will demonstrate that the range of political pressures which the two committees experienced, the political context in which they were established and, by means of an examination of the views of various institutions and sector agencies, the weight of representation and the diversity of opinion on the University College title, were critical factors in determining their conclusions on this issue.

Despite the similarities in remit and approach, the outcomes as they related to the shape and structure of the sector and expressed in the respective Reports, differed significantly. The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education under Dearing, although deferential in its view of the work of the previous major inquiry, (3) reflected a philosophy which diverged significantly from that adopted by the Robbins Committee, retrospectively described by its Chairman as

> *'....building on existing foundations. We hoped that some regional colleges, central institutions and colleges of education could gradually be given university status....In this sense we hoped that there would be preserved....a more or less continuous spectrum in the developing system of higher education.'*
>
> (Robbins, 1981: 99).

The significance of the term 'developing system' in this context should be noted. The Robbins Committee, to the extent that was politically achievable and consistent with the vision of the future of higher education promulgated by a subsequent Secretary of State Anthony Crosland, sought to build on existing foundations, retaining a unitary structure while recognizing the existence of a broad spectrum of higher education comprising both autonomous and non-autonomous institutions. The Committee attempted

> *'....to draw a horizontal line separating the two sectors and that as institutions below the line reached maturity they should be promoted, with immediate promotion for the Colleges of Advanced Technology and the transference to the autonomous sector of the Colleges of Education'*
>
> (Niblett *et.al.*, 1975; 221).

While the vision of the Robbins Committee, although in many respects limited and misconceived (Trow, 1964; 1989), was damaged by changes in the policy framework which established the binary system in the aftermath of the Report, the National Committee

123

of Inquiry into Higher Education, arguably, has failed in a more direct, pragmatic and explicitly argued way to initiate, support, or indeed to recognize (or at least publicly acknowledge) the need for fundamental structural reform. The historical perspective in Chapter 3 demonstrates the weight of the status issue as it relates to individual institutional development and sectoral reform, an issue which, it is argued, neither Committee grasped effectively. The parallels in circumstance and perception surrounding the establishment of the Robbins Committee and the Dearing Inquiry are striking, with an atmosphere of high expectation, the effects of expansion pressing the urgent need for structural reform, the perceived impact of the technological revolution (in the case of the Dearing inquiry, the information revolution), and the political need to resolve accumulated difficulties relating to the management of higher education. Whilst the underlying approaches and the conclusions of the two review bodies, bearing directly on the size, shape and structure of the higher education sector, the issue of structural reform, the diversity of institutional type and, most importantly here, the issue of university college title and status differed to some extent, each was confronted, perhaps with varying degrees of discomfort, with the conservatism and traditional, elitist values and status considerations which pervade the governance and management of British higher education (Trow, 1964, 1989; Robertson, 1998).

4.2   The Robbins Committee

4.2.1   The Changing Sector: the beginning of expansion

In the period from 1962-3 to 1967-68 the number of students in full-time higher education in Britain increased from 217,000 to 376,000, growth which was described as a

'.....*fantastic explosion*.....' (Layard *et.al.*, 1969: 14). This was generally attributed to the combination of the increase in the birth rate at the end of the Second World War and an increase in the number of those gaining qualifications appropriate for entry into higher education as a result of a series of complex and interrelated factors including economic success, the educational aspirations of successive generations, labour market demands and a series of intangible social influences in which

> '....*the spread of higher education tend(ed) to make possession of a higher qualification....(an)....indispensable symbol of status.*'
> (Layard *et. al.*, 1969: 17).

However, while the demand-side of the higher education scene was changing significantly, the supply-side remained inflexible and uncoordinated, lacking in any strategic sense of future expansion, unable to accommodate the increasing demand (Layard, 1969). The percentage of the age group achieving the minimum university entrance qualifications had risen by more than 50 per cent in the period 1954-1962, whereas the percentage entering university had risen by only 25 per cent and had actually fallen from 72 per cent in 1958 to 61 per cent by 1962 (Robbins, 1963: 12). It was clear that the existing structure and pattern of university provision was failing to respond to the increased demand, whatever its nature and source.

Higher education for this 'overspill' was provided by colleges of advanced technology, other technical colleges or teacher training colleges. The Report of the Robbins Committee provided an explicit philosophy of expansion and a five-year programme in response to the immediate and urgent problem of ensuring that the supply of places in higher education

125

reflected demand from potential entrants (rather than demand in the economy for the products of higher education) and that

> 'Compared with the 216,000 students in full-time higher education in Great Britain in 1962/63, places should be available for about 390,000 in 1973/4 and, on present estimates, for about 560,000 in 1980/1'
>
> (Robbins, 1963: 277, Para.. 1).

Although there was little enthusiasm for expansion among the universities in 1959-60, the University Grants Committee, the body which '......did most of what thinking there was on future expansion...' (Layard et. al., 1969: 17), was, in fact, proceeding of its own volition with the establishment of the 'new' universities to meet the anticipated increase in demand for university places (Shattock, 1996).

Nonetheless, the Robbins Report was radical on the need for growth and greater social equity, Lord Robbins himself maintaining, although in retrospect, that

> 'a great variety of statistical tests, which it would be perverse to question, go to demonstrate that the so-called pool of ability is much more extensive than has been commonly realised and that, given adequate financial support, the supply of those who are able, on present admission standards, to achieve good university qualifications, is likely to be an increasing proportion of the relevant age groups for many years to come'
>
> (Robbins, 1966: 3).

In this regard, the Report demonstrated the massive class differentials (4) in educational opportunity with the children of higher professionals thirty-three times more likely to be enrolled in full-time education (Robbins 1963: 50). The evidence, in fact, suggests that expansion within the framework established in the post-Robbins decades and particularly

in the 1990s has not substantially reduced these inequities in educational opportunity (Robertson and Hillman, 1997).

Importantly, the Report was conservative in its view of the framework in which the expansion of higher education would take place and projected into the future the (then) existing rates of growth sustained by the pre-existing characteristics, balance and structure of the sector. Enrolment projections were based on recent trends, not all of which were linear, and failed to take account of a range of 'accelerators' which would increase the demand for higher education beyond the current rate of demand (Trow, 1964). Such projections promoted a pattern of authoritative planning for the availability of university places in a period of expansion which then failed to take account of the potential demand on the sector from future expansion based on the principles of economic demand and individual social and educational aspiration which the Report had itself identified. In citing a range of social and economic forces which would increase the demand for higher education beyond that which could be expected form extrapolating previous trends, Trow suggested at the time that the Report

> '....enunciated a genuinely new principle which rests British higher education on popular demands, but then proceeds to ignore the revolutionary implications of this principle by planning in a more traditional fashion for a specific number of places. The question now is: has Robbins recommended a system of higher education flexible enough to meet a qualified demand that exceeds their projections. '

> (Trow, 1964: 120).

This view was not universal. Some regarded the implications of the Report as profound. One commentator suggested that

127

> *'The walls of the academic Jericho have fallen at the feet of the first really*
> *clear and uninhibited blast of the trumpets'*

> (Morris, 1963: 9).

Trow, less convinced of the victory, was critical of its caution. Maintaining that the Report had failed to reflect the full implications of its revolutionary principles, he argued that the pattern it projected was that of an inverted pyramid, with the elite institutions, the universities, maintaining pre-eminence in numbers as well as prestige, a consequence of which was to slow the rate of growth of higher education and to reduce its responsiveness to social and economic change, precisely those problems which the Report was intended to address. Recognising that the real meaning of an event lies in the unfolding of its consequences, Trow referred later to 'the Robbins Trap' arguing that

> *'The Robbins report was a powerful conception.... of how to expand*
> *Britain's elite higher education through liberal instruments and traditional*
> *processes, without having to surrender the basic values and assumptions on*
> *which its elite forms of education were and are based. (The Report)....*
> *promised growth, and indeed delivered growth, without creating the*
> *structural or normative conditions for continued growth and development*
> *toward mass higher education . It carried the system right up to the ceiling*
> *of elite higher education - at about 14 or 15 per cent'*
> (Trow, 1989: 62).

4.2.2   The Robbins Committee and the University Colleges

The Report, radically, willed the ends of an expanded system of higher education but failed to enable the structural means to achieve the continuing expansion of the system beyond its own limited vision. In response to the exigencies of rising, unmet demand the Committee addressed directly the issue of the shape of the sector and the pattern of institutions within

it, particularly whether existing types of institution would collectively be able to meet the needs both of students and of the country.

Specifically, evidence was presented to the Committee which suggested that some of the additional places should be provided in institutions of a new type. The Report states

> *'We have received many suggestions from witnesses for the creation of new institutions , sometimes called 'university colleges', which would be rather less than universities but rather more than technical colleges or training colleges as they are today'*
>
> (Robbins, 1963: 147, Para.446).

The Report considered a range of proposals some of which invoked the principle of the American Liberal Arts College, while others emphasised professional and vocational studies as the dominant curriculum pattern in these new institutions. It was also suggested that such colleges should not have postgraduate students and, indeed, that their undergraduate work should be confined to courses of pass degree standard. The Committee, although in sympathy with many of the educational objectives and fully recognizing the need for experimentation in the planning of courses, rejected the proposal for the creation of a new type of institution to conduct such experiment (Robbins, 1963: 147, Para. 447).

The argument against the establishment of university colleges was based on three grounds which not only demonstrated the reticence of the Committee to countenance alternative forms and structures, but, in part, at least, was justified by an impenetrable, circular argument which, without the unrelenting pressure of demand, may have remained

uncontested.   The fundamental objection was that the proposals would create too static a

type of institution.   The Report stated

> *'We are in favour of developments in Colleges of Education and Regional*
> *Colleges that may make some of them virtually equivalent to what is*
> *proposed.   But it is one thing to reach such a position as a result of*
> *progress, and quite another to be created as an institution that is not*
> *allowed to develop'*
>
> (Robbins, 1963 : 147, Para. 448).

This justification failed to acknowledge the opportunity presented to the Committee to

describe the future shape of the sector in such a way that this problem would have been

avoided and demonstrated that the historical examples of institutions designated as

university colleges and their subsequent development into well-respected and successful

universities were ignored.

In a later account of this view, Robbins maintained that the Committee rejected these

> *'....novel experiments....(because)....we thought that completely new*
> *institutions of this sort would be more difficult to staff than enlarged*
> *universities .   We also felt that....a policy of deliberately creating*
> *institutions which by definition were to be kept a little lower than the angels*
> *- the universities - might give rise to more social tensions and new senses of*
> *artificial inferiority than they are worth'*
>
> (Robbins, 1966: 23).

Lord Robbins, somewhat disingenuously perhaps, proceeds then to question

> *'Why is it that we are now confronted with the prospect of an educational*
> *caste system more rigid and hierarchical than ever before?   Why is it that*
> *the hopes of liberalising the system of higher education which were aroused*
> *in so many quarters two years ago have been so ruthlessly quenched?*
> *....(One).... influence....(is).... the idea that the universities must be kept*
> *pure.'*
>
> (Robbins, 1966: 151-152).

130

The second oppositional argument to the creation and formal recognition of university colleges, and a corollary to the first, was that it was regarded as more effective to encourage innovation in established institutions than to attempt to begin, with restricted aspirations, on a completely new basis. This view would have been more readily acceptable had the record of existing universities been more impressive in adapting and engaging in structural reform to accommodate change. (5)

The third objection which the Robbins Report identified was that

> '*It is difficult to quantify the hypothetical group of young people who are said to want courses of a general character but would prefer such courses to be outside a university setting....at present we have grave doubts that colleges that are neither universities nor colleges with a professional orientation would attract students. It is impossible to plan provision for a future need that cannot be quantified*'
>   (Robbins, 1963: 148, Para. 450).

This encapsulates the conservatism and lack of vision of the Robbins Report in failing to recognize, on the basis of the evidence that was available at the time, the potential scale of unfulfilled educational demand, aspiration and achievement. The planning framework which the Report utilized was based on extrapolation of past and current enrolment patterns, failing to recognize that the nature and scale of the demand was changing. Most importantly, the Report failed to acknowledge that structural change which increases capacity generates further and progressively increasing demand. This is evident from the projections made by the Committee itself. The Report recommended an additional 558,000 full-time places by 1980/1, of which 346,000 should be in universities. The recommended number of university places was determined by the view that

'....the proportion of qualified school leavers entering the universities in 1980/81 will then be roughly the same as in the mid-1950s, when the competition for entry had not yet produced its undesirable effects. This means that of the students entering full-time higher education in 1980/81, the proportion going to universities will be 60 per cent, as against 55 per cent at present'

(Robbins, 1963: 152, Para. 165).

The growth in the sector projected by the Report was based on: the size of the age group (18-21); the proportion of the age group obtaining the relevant qualifications; and the proportion of those qualified who apply. Trow (1964) argued that these three factors accounted for 83 per cent of the recommended expansion, with the remainder being accounted for by an anticipated growth in overseas recruitment and numerous other factors such as changes in the length of courses. He concluded that:

'The recommended expansion that results from these projections seems to me almost certainly inadequate to meet the growth in qualified demand over the next two decades'

(Trow, 1964: 119).

The significance of the failure of the Report to take account of the large but indeterminate growth in the demand for higher education from those qualified for entry was that the margin of error generated by a traditional planning approach, captured in a phrase used in another context as being in '*......the best British tradition, stumbl(ing) backwards into the future, looking longingly to the past......*' (Handy and Aitken, 1986; 127), actually *reduced* the importance of the recommendations regarding future size, and greatly *increased* the importance of the views on the future structure of the higher education system.

132

A central feature of the Report in this respect was that, of the autonomous institutions which were intended to support the anticipated expansion - universities; colleges of art and technology (CATs) and teacher training colleges; and institutions of further education - the greatest expansion was proposed in the universities. This failed to recognize that in the longer term, structure was more significant than size and that it was necessary to create a system flexible enough to meet a level of qualified demand for university education that exceeded the Report's projections.

From the perspective of this study, an important and unexplained feature of the Report as it related to the structure of the sector was that, although it referred in the evidence as presented to the Committee to the concept of the 'university college' as *new*, the descriptions of the sector which the Committee employed in its contextual investigations and information-gathering exercises referred frequently to major, well-established universities as having developed from their original designations as university colleges. This is an important confusion since it confirms the dissociation of the nature and form of the pre-existing university colleges, the rationale for their creation and the justification for their continued existence, from the considerations relating to the establishment of a 'new' type of university college institution. The oppositional arguments with which the Robbins Committee justified its rejection of the proposal to create new university colleges considered earlier were, interestingly, not applied to the pre-existing institutions bearing the same title, again, demonstrating the lack of historical perspective.

The term University College and the status it implied, had clearly been an established part of the higher education lexicon prior to the formation of many of those institutions regarded by the Robbins Committee as part of the mainstream higher education sector. Indeed, as shown in the previous chapter, many had benefited from the use of the title as an intermediate stage towards the granting of a charter enabling them to award their own degrees.

Essentially, the Report recommended the establishment of six further universities (6) and the selection of a number of special institutions for rapid development in high level teaching in science and technology of which Imperial College and the Manchester and Glasgow Colleges of Technology should provide the focus. It was suggested that one of the new universities should emphasize science and technology in its curriculum. It was also recommended that the colleges of advanced technology should be upgraded to the status of technological universities and that a National Council for Academic Awards (7) should be formed to authorize the curricula for degrees of the non-autonomous technical colleges and arrange for their examinations. A federal relationship was proposed between the teacher-training colleges and the universities in which the administrative responsibility for the Colleges of Education (as they would be known) would be transferred from the local authorities to existing universities. (8)

The approach and outcomes of the Report, and indeed the response to it, reflected the unease with which government and higher education approached diversity of institutional form and structure as a potential solution to the inexorable increase in participation rates.

The recommendation for the creation of six new universities was not accepted. The attendant recommendations relating to the structure and status of institutions within the sector which sought to build upon existing foundations in the expectation that some of the regional colleges, central institutions and colleges of education (the existing teacher-training colleges) could gradually be given university status as quasi-autonomous corporations under the University Grants Committee, rather than under local or central authority, were overtaken by a major development in policy relating to the structure of higher education. The Report, in some senses unwittingly, represented the catalyst which facilitated the transition from the pre-existing unitary system (to the extent that it could be described as a system at all) to the binary system which was established in the late 1960s. Anthony Crosland, the (then) Secretary of State in a speech on 27 April 1965, rejected the Robbins Committee's conception of a unitary system and advocated a binary or dual system which comprised the university sector (in which, selectively following the recommendations of the Robbins Committee, he included the colleges of advanced technology) and the public sector institutions headed by polytechnics, existing or to be created. Subsequently, Robbins expressed his opposition to the abandonment of the unitary system which so many of the structural changes recommended in the Report were designed to protect and maintain. (9)

Within three decades, government-initiated changes in the structure of higher education had re-established the unitary system when, following significant pressure from the polytechnics following their incorporation, the 1992 Further and Higher Education Act

ended the distinction between universities and polytechnics in degree-awarding powers, the channels for the funding of teaching and the dual support system of research funding.

In the aftermath of the Robbins Report, in part as a consequence of its failure to fulfil its radical promise, growth was not constrained by (even well qualified) demand but rather by restrictions on supply emanating from the self-perpetuating values and monolithic structure of elite higher education with the traditional structure and values of the university at its centre (Trow 1989). The problems and pressures on finances, staff and estate, and the disruption of the higher education sector in accommodating the renewed expansion of the period 1990-93 is the clearest proof of this case. The period of consolidation and relative stability of the 1970s and 1980s prevented the earlier realization of this failure to establish the conditions for organized and systematic expansion. By the late 1980s with the demonstrable government commitment to the substantial expansion of higher education, the inability of the existing structure to deliver these policy aims was evident.

In the 1990s it was difficult to contest the view that:

> *'Real diversity would mean institutions and programmes of sharply varying cost and quality, and the surrender of the academic gold standard and the honours degree as the standard for all institutions in the system. It is not the high standards and costs of British institutions that preclude further expansion, so much as the fierce determination that those standards will prevail and characterise all degree-granting institutions and programmes... that is another way of saying that all expansion must be within elite forms and standards and at elite costs'*
>
> (Trow, 1989: 63).

It is evident that similar constraints and the legacies of a prestige hierarchy affected the approach and outcomes of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in 1996-97, established with a comparable air of expectation to that surrounding the Robbins Committee and confronting many of the same problems although different in scale, more extreme in their implications for the sector, and more urgent for continued national economic success.

4.3   The Intervening Decades: aftermath and prelude.

One of the enduring aspects of the series of problems which has confronted successive governments and the higher education sector in recent decades in responding to the pressure to democratize educational opportunity, and one which reflects most clearly the extent to which status and hierarchy continue to dominate the British higher education system, has been (and remains) the issue of institutional status and title.   There is an unresolved tension across the sector (and within institutions and individuals) in which the substantial modification of the values, processes and, particularly the structure of higher education necessitated by the pressures of expansion and the demands upon the sector from its range of stakeholders is confronting an equally obdurate resistance to change.   Most significantly for this study, the change in the scale of British higher education from a pre-1945 position in which 18 universities existed but no university system, to one in which 105 universities now exist as part of a broader higher education system, but in which significant levels of higher education exist beyond the mainstream universities, is testimony to the need to ensure that structure, rather than size, is the most effective means of responding to the pressures of expansion.   It has also focused attention on the anomalies

of the status of some groups of institutions which have largely delivered the recent expansion and, as a corollary, exposed serious weaknesses in the rationale for the existing pattern of institutional providers which is increasingly regarded as unstable and unsuited to the current need (Shattock, 1996: 24).

That the existing pattern of institutions is restrictive and is increasingly unable to deliver the level of expansion and the type of educational provision which will meet individual aspiration, the needs of the economy or those of the wider society, is evidenced by the priority which the structure and shape of the sector, and the status of institutions within it, assumed in the agenda of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.

In the consultation period of the Dearing inquiry much was written about the expansion of higher education and the structure of the sector. (10) The long-standing and deepening concern that the higher education system had been progressively failing to meet the needs of a post-industrial, information-based, society, or the economic, social and educational aspirations of substantial segments of its population, generated further attempts by means of a range of policy initiatives through the late 1980s and early 1990s (and for a range of motives) to transform higher education from an elite to a mass system which, crucially for its success, captured the imagination and concerted support of a range of influential individuals and powerful groups in society whose views on other social, political and economic issues remain widely divergent. (11)

In 1987 the Conservative Government set out its position on the anticipated and required expansion of the higher education sector and its relationship to the economic success of the nation, unequivocally stating

> '....*Above all there is an urgent need, in the interests of the nation as a whole, and therefore of universities, polytechnics and colleges themselves, for higher education to take increasing account of the economic requirements of the country. Meeting the needs of the economy is not the sole purpose of higher education, nor can higher education alone achieve what is needed. But this aim, with its implications for the scale and quality of higher education, must be vigorously pursued.*'

(DES, 1987. Cmnd 114. London, HMSO: Para. 1.4 -1.5).

At the time of this publication, since 1979, the number of full-time home students in Great Britain had risen by more than 85,000 - almost three times the increase achieved in the decade previously - a level of demand for which neither the Robbins philosophy nor structure had prepared the sector. The size of the 18-19 year old age group had peaked in 1982 and the continuing increase in student numbers reflected higher rates of participation both by 18-19 year olds - for whom the Age Participation Index (12) had increased from 12.4 in 1979 to 14.2 in 1986 and by mature entrants (defined at that time as age 21 and over) whose numbers had grown by 25% since 1979. In 1987 virtually all this growth in full-time student numbers and approximately three-quarters of the increase in part-time recruitment (72000, or 27%) had been accommodated in the polytechnic and colleges sector (DES, 1987).

In November 1986 the Government had published projections of demand (13) which illustrated the anticipated increased demand for higher education places although it was

clear that while policies based on response to student demand may have been considered a sufficient basis for planning and financing higher education while the numbers of young people qualified to enter higher education were growing, this was not acceptable in the face of a sharp demographic decline.

> *'There is no reason to suppose that employers' requirements for graduates and diplomates will fall in parallel with the one-third fall in the size of the 18-19 year old age group by 1996. For the present......the projection involves a 5% increase in student numbers between 1985 and 1990, followed by a return to current intake levels in the mid 1990s....'*

<div align="right">

(DES, 1987.Cmnd. 114 London,
HMSO Para. 2.12 - 2.13).

</div>

Reiterating throughout the continuing commitment to the modified Robbins principles, maintaining that places should be available for all who have the necessary intellectual competence, motivation and maturity to benefit from higher education, this document stressed the importance of adjusting the balance of provision to match the needs of the economy and to accommodate students with a wider range of academic and practical experience, many of whom would not have the traditional qualifications for entry, implying changes in teaching methods and course design.

These general policy commitments, emerging over a period of more than a decade and from a range of different philosophical positions, required the higher education sector to confront a number of central principles and attitudes whose continuing influence on the provision of higher education in the 1990s, enabled Trow to maintain, re-stating with some justification his arguments of three decades previously, that

' (The problem) is the result of strains arising from Britain's efforts to create a system of higher education that can serve an advanced or post-industrial society without surrendering the elite character and size of the existing system. The roots of that problem do not lie in the present government's policies but in deep British conceptions of the nature of the university, and in the relation of higher education to the larger society'

(Trow, 1991: 14-15).

The 1990s has witnessed a massive expansion in participation in higher education, although exaggerated claims for the success of policies designed to widen access and equalize educational opportunity should be treated cautiously since the nature of the expansion is differentiated across a range of traditionally under-represented groups and types of higher education institutions (Robertson and Hillman, 1997). This has been accompanied by significant changes in status following the incorporation of the polytechnic sector in 1988 and, in 1992, its attainment of university status. There has been a re-emphasis on the relationship between an effective higher education sector and a successful economy (Department of Trade and Industry, 1994; 1995; Keep, 1995). The economic imperatives and the demands for a skilled workforce involving a continuous process of re-skilling and multiple changes in career direction combined with the commitment of a new Labour Government to the principle of lifelong learning, increasing participation rates and widening access have made new and particular demands on the higher education sector which its existing capacity and structures are clearly failing to meet.

The consequent pressures on staff, physical resources and academic standards which the radical changes in participation rates and the unprecedented rate of growth created in the higher education sector in the early 1990s led to the recognition that in order to achieve

141

these policy goals and to respond to a rapidly changing and highly competitive global economy, a further examination of the structure and funding of higher education was necessary. Shattock (1996) is unequivocal in his view of the nature of the problem and a potential solution. He argues that

> *'We have a large, seriously underfunded, centrally managed system committed to a more or less common approach to academic standards and to the linkage of status to research prestige. And, for historical reasons, we have a hierarchy of institutions constructed on a basis which, while it stimulates competition, can also encourage a sense of failure......The expansion of the early 1990s was allowed to proceed without careful thought as to its long-term impact on higher education.... (and).... unless a greater understanding of the importance of institutional diversity and variety can be established, the last fifty years will be seen to have created a university system which will act as a straitjacket to prevent innovation and development in the next fifty....The survival of such a university system....in anything like its present form would be hard to predict.'*
> (Shattock, 1996: 25).

4.4   The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education

In the autumn of 1994 the Government initiated a review of higher education with a view to determining, in the first instance, its appropriate size and shape at the turn of the century and beyond. In July 1995, the Secretary of State reported to Parliament on the preliminary consultation which had demonstrated the extent of the changes in both higher education itself and the context in which it operates, revealing the need for a more extensive and wider-ranging view of the future development of higher education to which all those with an interest should have an opportunity to make a full contribution. In February 1996 the Secretary of State announced the appointment of a National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education to consider the structure and funding of higher education in the United Kingdom. (14)

142

This inquiry, led by Sir Ron Dearing and whose membership comprised representatives of education, banking and commerce, was regarded as the most important review of the higher education sector since the Robbins Committee thirty years earlier and had a wide ranging brief to examine a series of fundamental aspects of the higher education system which included *inter alia:* the organisation and funding of teaching and research, the relationship of higher education to the economy, and information technology. (15) Crucially for this study, the terms of reference also required a view and recommendations on the pattern of institutions providing higher education across the sector and the shape and structure of higher education provision generally.

4.4.1 Sector Representations to the Dearing Inquiry

The consultation exercise during the course of the inquiry revealed a widespread commitment to: the expansion of higher education; the maintenance of quality and standards in the context of that expansion; and the principle of diversity in higher education (Quality Support Centre, 1997). However, not unexpectedly perhaps, significant variation emerged in the views as to the most appropriate structure for the higher education sector and, within that, the most suitable framework of institutional designation to achieve these objectives. An analysis of elements of the detail of these different perspectives provides an insight into the political and status sensitivities which pervaded the Committee's deliberations on the issue of institutional title.

143

The representative bodies across the sector adopted (at least in their formal, published stance) a relatively calm and compliant approach to the issue of institutional title - a position which differed markedly from the institutions affected directly. The HEFCE submission to the Committee raised the issue of institutional title, devoting one paragraph (of 102) to the question, suggesting that

> *'A further issue which has arisen since the abolition of the binary line relates to the nomenclature and in particular the role and status of HE colleges. For specialist colleges this may not be a problem, but for multi-disciplinary colleges, problems of identity may arise which affect mission and marketability both at home and overseas. This has led to the confusing adoption of ambiguous titles - something which affects Further Education Colleges as well as HEIs. The Council has no powers in this area, but believes that it would be helpful if the question of titles and nomenclature were clarified and settled'*

> (Higher Education Funding Council for England, November 1996c. Para. 86: 20).

This statement implies a disinterested position which belied the unease which numerous national agencies were experiencing in establishing (in the context of published documents such as HEQC Quality Audit reports) a formal and mutually acceptable designation for those institutions which had adopted, with varying degrees of legitimacy, the title university college. (16)

The Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP), representing a substantial part of the non-university higher education sector, adopted a position which was likely not to conflict with the senior representative organisation in higher education, the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals. Expressing unreserved commitment to the principle of

diversity in the higher education sector, the SCOP submission maintained that the criterion

for recognition as an HEI should be a simple majority of students at HE level.

In addition, in view of the fact that some of its member institutions were in the throes of

making application for university status, SCOP criticised the current policy on granting

the title of university as unduly restrictive and therefore damaging to a number of UK

institutions. This position determined its stance on the university college title issue (17):

> *'It is the view of SCOP that the only criteria for use of the university title
> should be: the power to award degrees; and the active pursuit of research
> and scholarly activity. We do not regard criteria such as size or range of
> subjects as pre-requisites. Recognising that this is unlikely to change in the
> near future....institutions which do not meet the current criteria for
> university status should nevertheless be allowed to use the title university
> college if they: have been granted taught degree awarding powers by the
> Privy Council; or are accredited by a recognised UK university to offer
> courses leading to the award of taught degrees and diplomas of that
> university and have the agreement of the university for the use of the title
> university college.'*
>
> (Standing Conference of Principals, 1996:12).

Politically the most influential position on this issue was that adopted by the Committee of

Vice Chancellors and Principals (CVCP). In its submission to the National Committee of

Inquiry into Higher Education, the CVCP expressed strong support for greater

collaboration and complementarity between universities and other education providers.

The CVCP referred to cross-sector collaboration in the following terms:

> *'Successful relationships between further and higher education form an
> important means of progression....We expect to see a strengthening of
> FE/HE links in future. Students will increasingly be concerned not with
> sectors of education and their boundaries, but with the accessibility,
> affordability, quality and relevance of the provision offered'*
>
> (CVCP, 1996: 10-11, Paras.25-27).

145

Elsewhere the document commented that

> *'Relationships between FE Colleges and universities extend access to higher education , enable universities to reach out into the community and create networks which are responsive to local needs and circumstances. Arrangements built on partnerships across regions, with universities at the 'hub' are now a strong feature....the trend is away from geographically dispersed and multiple relationships between university and partner colleges and towards more exclusive links with fewer partners'*

(CVCP, 1996: 18, Paras.88-89).

This position specifically reflected the rapid and extensive development of franchise agreements (in which, typically, the first year of undergraduate programmes were taught in a further education college under licence from a parent university) to accommodate the expansion of the early 1990s, arrangements which had generated serious problems of quality and funding (Rhodes, 1996).

The Further Education Funding Council (FEFC), in its submission to the Dearing Inquiry, envisaged that greater collaboration between further education colleges and higher education institutions would be necessary to ensure choice and diversity and that, as many students' options for pursuing higher education will be more restricted by financial and related pressures, the role of regional colleges will become increasingly significant. (18) The submission was clear in its view that there should not be a demarcation of higher education provision by type of institution or sector. The submission stated that

> *'The Council is aware that there are plans underway in some areas for the establishment of 'university colleges'. These would be established as satellite centres of existing universities typically in areas where there is no higher education institution. The Council is concerned that such plans are being pursued in isolation and without collaboration with the further*

education colleges which serve the area and which are equipped to provide higher education courses'

<div align="right">(FEFC, 1996: Para. 28).</div>

However, in addition to these territorial difficulties, a range of collaborative arrangements with higher education colleges or 'mixed economy' F/HE institutions and universities had created a series of issues relating to institutional title and status in which the expectations and aspirations of the colleges, following the historical precedents set by many of the partner universities themselves, had been raised either through the fact of being involved in delivering higher education and the recognition which accompanied it, or by university partners establishing forms of agreement which enabled or encouraged institutions to adopt designations which reflected these aspirations. (19)

4.4.2 The Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals: The Lauwerys Report

The CVCP established a working party on university college title (20) whose remit was to advise the CVCP on the content of its submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in the context of the growing uncertainty and concern regarding the use of titles incorporating the word 'University' or denoting University College status.

The CVCP had been aware of a lack of consistency in the criteria and procedures relating to the adoption and use of university college title, and the Working Party during the course of its investigations

> *'....became acutely aware of the wide variations that now exist. These included HEIs which had been granted the title in the context of a long and established relationship with a validating university according to strict*

criteria laid down by the senior partner; of colleges which had sought the use of such a title but had been denied by the validating university, in some instances pending clarification of the legal situation; of other institutions which had simply announced their intention to use the title, and then introduced it, though with the acquiescence of the parent institution; and of one instance where the title had been conferred on an institution whose status was that of a Further Education College (FEC), albeit one with a significant proportion of its work at Higher Education (HE) level, being the sole provider in the county.'

(CVCP, 1997b; 1).

There was concern that the extent and the implications of this variation in current practice were such that, whatever the outcomes of the investigation, any recommendations would be potentially problematic for one group of institutions or another. The Report identified a number of problems emanating from the inconsistent use of the university college title which threatened the credibility of higher education providers. The Report concluded that the titles 'university college', and especially 'university', should retain a particular significance which could be reasonably interpreted and trusted by those external to education since it was felt that the reputation of British higher education could be endangered if appropriate controls were not in place. Significantly, echoing comments made by SCOP in its submission to the Dearing Inquiry, the Working Party concluded that a number of institutions saw the adoption of university college title as significant both in marketing terms and as a developmental step in the progression towards the goal of degree-awarding powers or, in some cases, full university status, but noted that

'Some of these ambitions are currently constrained, either directly by the parent institution, which is reluctant to commit itself to conferring the title in the current uncertainty, or indirectly through DfEE pressure. A growing frustration among such colleges arises from the adoption without formal authority of the title by some other institutions which have no greater justification for doing so'

(CVCP, 1997b: 2).

Following an analysis of the legal position, the Working party concluded that there were

four ways in which an institution may properly include the word 'University' in its title :

- *'by the Crown, traditionally by granting or amending a Charter;*

- *by Statute, the 1992 Act having empowered the Privy Council to amend the title of existing institutions;*

- *by private Act of Parliament;*

- *by following the due procedure for the adoption of a 'Business name' which includes seeking approval by the Board of Trade and the Privy Council. This relates solely to the 'trading name' of the institutions and does not alter its legal title. '*

(CVCP, 1997b: 2).

However, the Report acknowledged that there were many issues surrounding these

categories which remained unclear, for example: whether these routes were exclusive;

whether they applied to the title 'University' and to the title 'University College'; and

most significantly, whether universities had the legal right to confer the title 'University

College' on other institutions. (21)   It left unanswered the question regarding the sanctions

to be applied to any institution found to be using the title University College without

formal authority from one of these sources, since there was unresolved confusion relating

to the legality and status of the 'devices' which institutions were employing, including

additional descriptors such as '.....in the university sector' and a range of 'straplines' for

marketing purposes, for example 'a college of the University of.....' which have been in

widespread use during the 1990s.   The Report suggested that the use of these 'devices' in

instances where they are misleading should be avoided and was categorical in its view that

> *'An HEI is entirely correct in describing itself as a higher education sector institution, but if it is not a university or a university college it is misleading to describe itself as a University Sector College or institution. Descriptors such as 'creating a new university' are misleading and have no firm*

foundation, and as such should be avoided. It is recommended that this issue also be covered in Post-Dearing primary legislation'

(CVCP, 1997b: 5).

The Working Party recommended to the CVCP that its submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education should itself contain a proposal that the Government should publish criteria for the use of 'University College' title and clarify the powers of the Privy Council

> *'....by inserting a clause in a future education bill, to amend Section 77 of the Further and Higher Education Act 1992 (Section 49 of the Further and Higher Education [Scotland] Act 1992) to make it clear that the Privy Council's powers of consent apply to the title 'university college' as well as 'university'.*

(CVCP, 1997b: 5).

Not surprisingly, those institutions directly involved in this status dilemma mounted a forthright defence of their position both in their individual, institutional submissions (22) to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, and also where it was politically possible, collectively through a range of representative bodies to strengthen their case, (23) thus providing striking parallels with the historical development of the (now well-established) universities throughout the twentieth century (see Chapter 3).

4.4.3   The Dearing Inquiry and the University Colleges

The conclusions of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education relating to the issue of the designation 'university college' were unequivocal.   The Committee regarded the distribution, style and title of institutions as a matter of concern and, in examining these issues, supported the tradition established by the Robbins Committee that

'....the pattern (of institutions) must provide for organic growth.......it must neither force their development at an intolerable pace nor leave them undisturbed when foresight would indicate the need for action'

(Robbins, 1963: 150, Para. 460).

The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education focused its attention on: the diversity and autonomy of institutions; clarity of institutional status; and the scope of institutions providing publicly-funded higher education across the United Kingdom, issues which are reflected in the preceding analysis of the development of the university sector (see Chapter 3). The Report acknowledged the confusion of heredity which characterized the sector and which had produced a pattern of institutions of different: sizes, strengths, patterns of participation, geographical catchments and orientations; histories and allegiances, but recognized the strength in such diversity (The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, 1997, Para. 16.6: 249).

However, the Report referred explicitly to two forces which, the Committee felt, were adversely affecting this diversity of provision. The first, which is not directly relevant here, was what the Committee described as the pressure to institutional conformity brought about by funding arrangements which caused institutions to make similar choices (even to the point of compromising distinctive Mission statements) in response to the range of funding options available to them, a view strongly contested by the HEFCE in its submission to the Committee of Inquiry (HEFCE, 1996c).

The second, and a crucial determinant of the Committee's conclusions on the issue of university college title and clarity of institutional status, was the

'....apparent weakening in the responsibility and self-discipline exercised by some institutions. Our endorsement of institutional autonomy and diversity carries with it a presumption of institutional responsibility and self-discipline. We feel bound to take into account a number of recent failures in this respect....'

(Dearing, 1997. Para.16.15: 253).

The 'failures' of discipline relating to the title and name used by institutions to describe themselves was seen to compound the inability of the sector to construct a clear specification of the academic standards of graduate output which had been the subject of a lengthy, valuable, though largely inconclusive HEQC investigation since 1993. [24]

In particular, and clearly following the legal analysis adopted in the Annex of the Report of the CVCP Working Party on this issue distinguishing *title* and *name*, the Report stated that

'In the interests of public understanding there needs to be clarity and consistency in the use of both institutional titles (that is, how the Privy Council or Secretary of State has named the institution) and the use of institutional names (that is, how the institution describes itself to students and the wider public). At present titles and names do not always match. Nor do they always define sufficiently clearly membership of a particular institutional category.'

(Dearing, 1997. Para. 16.17 and16.18: 253).

Consequently, the Report recommended to the Government that:

'....it takes action as soon as possible to end the scope for confusion between the title and the name used by institutions, either through clarifying the legal position or by ensuring that conditions can be placed on the flow of public funds so that these go only to those institutions which agree to restrict their use of a name and title to that to which they are legally entitled'

(Dearing, 1997, Recommendation 62: 253).

152

The Committee also addressed specifically the issue of the use of 'university college' title and its comments and recommendations in this regard were equally direct, having taken evidence from the Chair of the CVCP Working Party on University College Title and from a group of institutional representatives (25) who were

> '.....seeking some discipline in the pattern of institutions by the creation of a new and tightly specified category, the 'university college'.

> (Dearing, 1997 Para. 16.27: 256).

The Report concluded that the title 'university college' applied legally only to those institutions which were constitutionally part of a federal university such as University College London, or where a pre-1992 university has bestowed the title under one of its Charter powers. Without explicitly acknowledging these developments as a symptom of the increasing marketization of education and the interrelated pressures of market forces and institutional status in maintaining sector position, the Report commented that the designation was being used more widely by institutions which had taken no legal steps to secure a formally approved change to their title and that such practice was proliferating. Concern was expressed particularly about its use by further education colleges under the terms of a university's charter and the Committee agreed that the use of the title 'university college' should be limited by clear criteria to give unambiguous meaning to its use. (26)

In setting aside the recommendations in the SCOP submission which suggested that accreditation agreements might provide one source of legitimacy for the use of the title

(and fuller consideration of the extent to which an accreditation agreement with a parent university provides a legitimate and substantial defining category of University Colleges is given in Chapter 5) , the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education maintained that the basis for authorizing the use of the title was balanced between three options: restricting the usage to institutions which are a constituent part of a university; extending the usage to those institutions which have, in their own right, taught degree-awarding powers; and applying it to colleges of higher and possibly further education which have a particular relationship with one university.   The Committee preferred the second of these options, although made an (impenetrably) ambiguous reference to its view that

> '....there is a convincing case to be made for creating a new category of institution which would have clearly defined characteristics, denoted by similarity to universities yet respecting the distinctive 'college' feel.'

(Dearing, 1997, Para.16.30: 256).

The case had certainly been made by the SCOP representatives both in writing and in oral evidence.   It is not clear from this phrase whether the Committee was suggesting that the case had been made and not accepted, or whether it was recommending to the Secretary of State that there was a valid case yet to be made for establishing this new category of institution.

Equally confused in another aspect of its conclusions on this issue, the Report acknowledged its lack of competence to address the powers of some pre-1992 university charters, yet simultaneously expressed its view that it was inappropriate that such powers should be used in relation to further education colleges which remain separate corporate bodies (Dearing, 1997, Para. 16.31: 256-257).   In addition, confirming the ambiguity of

its stance on the proposal to establish a new category of institution, the Committee also

expressed its reservations about the use of the powers by a chartered university in respect

of colleges of higher education where these do not have degree awarding powers and

where they remain separate corporate bodies (ibid.).

This confusing and badly expressed logic led to the recommendation to the government

that:

> '....it takes action either by clarifying the legal position or by ensuring that
> conditions can be placed upon the flow of public funds, to restrict the use of
> the title 'University College' to those institutions which are in every sense a
> college which is part of a university under the control of the university's
> governing body; and to those higher education institutions which have been
> granted degree-awarding powers'

(Dearing, 1997. Recommendation 65; 257)

In its conclusions to this part of the Report, the Committee recognized that the current

pattern of institutional provision is the product of historical and legislative circumstance

rather than of a consistent rationale, which has determined which counties, town or cities

have a university, or indeed more than one; which have colleges of higher education;

which have specialist monotechnics; and which have none of these. The Report suggests

that

> 'There is little doubt that an approach guided by strategic co-ordination
> whether by individual institutions or by an intermediary body, would have
> yielded a very different pattern, and possibly a more economical one if
> measured solely in terms of the costs of provision. However, it is also
> likely that such co-ordination might have limited institutions' creative
> enthusiasm, innovation and enterprise; and that the necessary expansion
> and diversity established over the last decade would not have been achieved
> at such modest capital cost or with such willingness'

(Dearing, 1997, Para. 16.32; 257).

155

This recognition of the value of the *ad hoc* development of higher education provision is sharply contradictory to the restrictive recommendations regarding the future shape of the sector and the pattern of institutions providing higher education, and represents a self-defeating criticism of the logic which produced the preceding commentary and recommendations in the Report on the issue of university college title.

This was evident in that, although many of the responses to the Report from the sector were complimentary and supportive, particularly those from representative bodies (SCOP, 1997; HEFCE, 1997), some individual institutional responses were implacably opposed to the conclusions as they related to the use of university college title (Lee, 1997), clearly perceiving the loss of university college title as a threat to their status and market. As these conclusions have been translated into legislation this opposition has manifested itself in numerous ways, including intense political lobbying in the case of Warrington Collegiate Institute (see Chapter 6), and the seeking of Judicial Review in the case of Liverpool Hope University College.

Prior to the publication of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, Coffield and Williamson, arguing from an explicitly ideological stance and reflecting on the politics of discourse, concluded that

> *'Dearing, like Robbins over thirty years before, is working within a particular discourse and in a political framework - the British state itself - which is archaic and which responds best to the needs of the privileged and the powerful....it is telling that the terms of reference enjoin..(the*

156

Committee)....to take account of the constraints of the Government's other spending priorities and affordability.'

(Williamson and Coffield,1997: 117).

In these circumstances it is perhaps unsurprising that the Report (and the policy statements which have followed it) have failed essentially to confront the reality which has shown over the past three decades the failure of the universities, despite the changes which they have introduced, to respond with sufficient speed and at an appropriate level to the technological, economic, social and demographic imperatives which have conveyed a clear and continuing message that

'....the old elite model has run its course and needs to be replaced'

(Coffield and Williamson 1997b: 2).

4.5   Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has examined the perspectives, approaches and outcomes of the two major reviews of the higher education sector within the last three decades which have sought to assess and, to some extent, re-define of the purpose, shape and structure of the higher education system in response to the series of economic, political, social, cultural, and demographic changes which have intensified the demands for increased participation and widened access to educational opportunity during the period. A wide range of interpretations exists of the general impact of the Robbins Report on the structure of higher education, some critical of its failure (Trow, 1964; 1989), some regretting the timidity of its radicalisms (Halsey, 1984), and others adopting a more generous view (Scott, 1988; Wagner, 1995). The commentaries on the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher

157

Education have been more consistently critical both in terms of outcome (Trow, 1998) and process (Robertson, 1999). Trow describes its recommendations as fundamentally flawed and maintains that the Report fails to show an intimate knowledge of the institutions about which it advises (1998: 93) whilst Robertson (1998) argued that the Report was

> '....*overburdened by its terms of reference, under-prepared in its presentation...(and)... instinctively conservative in its conclusions...*'

> (Robertson, 1998: 8)

This analysis has evaluated the work of these two Committees of Inquiry and has suggested that, in each instance, there has been a failure to respond to the opportunity to resolve the conflict between the pressures to reform and expand and the continuing concern to maintain the traditional value systems and structures of an elite system. This failure, it has been argued, has served *structurally* to perpetuate social inequality and to restrict social mobility and educational opportunity, and is based in a deep-rooted and self-perpetuating institutional status hierarchy reflecting not merely a distorted historical perspective (as confirmed by the evidence of institutional and sector development in Chapter 3), but also, perhaps intentionally, a simplistic view of the nature of the University College sector, failing to acknowledge the wide-ranging nature of the institutions which it comprises, the policy vacuum in which the sector has developed, and the complete absence of criteria used to define its membership. These issues are considered in detail in the attempt to construct the 'map' of the University College sector in Chapter 5.

Notes

1. On 8 February 1961 a Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Professor Lord Robbins

    '.....to review the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain and...... .to advise the Government on what principles its long term development should be based. In particular, to advise, in the light of these principles, whether there should be any changes in that pattern, whether any new types of institution are desirable and whether any modifications should be made in the present arrangements for planning and co-ordinating the development of the various types of institution. '

    > (Minute of Appointment: Treasury 8 February 1961: extract from *Report of the Committee on Higher Education.* (1963) Cmnd. 2154. London: HMSO).

2. The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society.* London: HMSO.

3. The influences of the Robbins Committee clearly spanned the intervening years to the extent that at a Conference held at the University of Central Lancashire in November 1996 during the consultation process with the higher education sector, Dearing remarked that he felt himself *'....standing in the shadow..... '* of Lord Robbins.

    > (Dearing. Conference Address, University of Central Lancashire 28 November, 1996).

4. In 1981 Lord Robbins referred to

    '....untapped resources of worthwhile talent in the families of manual workers. I am not ignorant of the hypothesis of capillary tendencies in the ability composition of the population....though I certainly think it is used to sustain attitudes of which I disapprove morally.....I am afraid that some at least of the different advantage taken of existing facilities for higher education between the upper as compared with the lower income groups is to be explained by tradition and ignorance as much as by inborn qualities, ridiculous as it may be to deny all genetic and family influences'

    > (Robbins, 1981: 109).

5. Shils (1962) in portraying the pre-Robbins period contrasted the *'....buzzing, booming confusion....'* of the typical American campus - *'....this heterogeneity and dispersion....'* - with the *'....determinate, well defined....'* British university and the *'....uncongeniality of its environment to innovation....'* (Shils in Shattock, 1996: 95-96).

6. Lord Robbins on later reflection commented that the recommendation for the creation of six new universities (which was not accepted) was

    '....based on highly misleading returns from existing, or already planned, universities regarding their future capacity. These had been very cautious; but as soon as the authorities saw that expansion was the order of the day, the issue was oversubscribed, so to speak......had we known of the willingness of the vice-chancellors to upgrade their eventual capacity, we should certainly have framed our recommendations differently'

    > (Robbins 1981: 98-99).

The eagerness of the CVCP in the late 1990s to demonstrate the universities' willingness and capacity to deliver the required further expansion into the next century clearly echoes the past.

7. This organization was, in fact, established as the Council for National Academic Awards with oversight of the new Polytechnic sector.

8. While it was evident that the universities were prepared to accept this transfer of responsibility and showed a considerable willingness to co-operate (University of London, Report by the Principal, 1964-65, p.11), the local authorities showed a hostility to the proposals relating to teacher training and, more generally, the Department of Education and Science was regarded as exhibiting '....a certain jealousy....for the area of its direct control....' when facing the '....uncontrolled evolution of the autonomous universities .'

(Robbins 1966: 153-154).

9. Lord Robbins commented

'we recognised the need for diversity both of academic and of administrative forms. But we conceived of the system as unitary in the sense that it was flexible and evolutionary and contained no unnecessary barriers or limitations on growth and transformation..... The philosophy of the Binary system negates all this....The Secretary of State may make speeches every week-end about his plans. He may paint the most splendid picture about the future of the so-called 'public sector' of his Binary system. But....if he wishes to force.... (students)....into his sector, he will have to raise the requirements of the university sector and thus intensify the disparity of esteem which he professes....to wish to avoid.'.

(Robbins 1966 ; 148-151)

Some years later, he repeated his opposition to the binary system,

'I cannot help thinking that Mr. Crosland's vision of the justification of what he conceived as the 'Public Sector'... was more than a trifle confused. And since the rulings, based on this vision and promulgated at Woolwich, definitely created barriers between the public sector and the university sector which had not been so definite before - no more universities for ten years, colleges of education to keep their existing status and affiliation - barriers which, in our conception of the spectrum might have been sensibly diminished, I cannot help feeling that, with the best will in the world, Mr. Crosland was taking premature and regrettable decisions'

(Robbins 1981: 101).

10. In the process of consultation the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education received 840 sets of written submissions from a range of organizations and institution; thirty-seven organizations were invited to give oral evidence to the Committee; and seven consultation conferences were held. (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education: Higher Education in the Learning Society , Paras. 3-8, pp386-388). The Report comprises 1700 pages of text.

11.   Whilst the motivations may be different (or perhaps described differently) the commitment to expand the provision of higher education is as evident in New Labour policies in 1997 as it was under the several Conservative Governments of the 1980s and early 1990s. The Conservative view was expressed in terms of the competitiveness of the British economy (DES 1987; DTI, 1994;1995;1996) whilst the Labour view utilised prodominantly the language of educational and social inclusion in 'The Learning Age' (DfEE 1998).

12.   The Age Participation Index (API) is the number of young home initial entrants to full-time higher education expressed as a percentage of the relevant age group, being half the total number of 18 and 19 year olds in the population.   (DES 1987. Cmnd 114. London : HMSO).

13.   DES (1986) *Projections of Future Demand for Higher Education 1986-2000* . London: Department of Education and Science.

14.   In a statement to the House of Commons on 19 February 1996, the Secretary of State in announcing the establishment of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education described the scale of the expanding sector and the need for a major review:

> *'Just over thirty years ago, the Robbins Committee set out a vision for expanding higher education in Great Britain. Since then, higher education has been transformed beyond the expectations even of Robbins. In total there are now over a million full-time students in the United Kingdom, five times as many as in Robbins' day. In addition , half a million people study part-time......By the year 2001, the number of graduates in the workforce is likely to be well over 3 million - twice as high as 1981.'*

Referring to the review which she had initiated over a year earlier, she confirmed that the responses at that time had

> *'.... emphasized the growing importance of higher education in securing our future competitiveness and economic growth. The global markets in which the UK has to compete have been transformed by an information revolution and other technological advances. Our economic success will increasingly depend on higher levels of knowledge, understanding and skills.... The Robbins Report provided a landmark for higher education policy that stood the test of time well. But it is time to take a fresh and comprehensive look at the challenges that face higher education in the UK as we approach the 21st century'*

> (Statement by the Secretary of State to the
> House of Commons: 19 February 1996).

15.   The significance of the economic imperatives was demonstrated by their prominence in the terms of reference of the Committee and was confirmed in a paper prepared by the DfEE which maintained that

> *'Higher education is vital in providing higher levels of skills and encouraging the flexible, responsive and creative approach that employers seek from their staff today in their drive for improved productivity, quality and service. Now, more than ever before, higher education has a key role to play in underpinning a modern, competitive economy. It is for this reason that there is in higher education today much more emphasis on the first Robbins objective - providing skills for employment'*

> (A position paper by the DfEE, the Scottish Office, the Welsh Office and the Department of Education for Northern Ireland submitted to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. June 1996).

An interesting counterpoint in the arguments surrounding the relationship of higher education to the economy came from the Principals of the Catholic Higher Education Colleges of England and Wales in the submission to the Dearing Inquiry in which, quoting Cardinal Hume, they reminded the Committee of the main purposes of education, stating that:

> 'Great emphasis is placed on meeting curriculum targets, on the acquisition of skills, on the need for learning how to learn, recognising that future generations will have to be adaptable and flexible to cope with a constantly changing labour market. These are, of course, essential. But these are not all. For education is not primarily for work, but for life. What we should value most in education is the cultivation of all those elements of human activity for which people cannot be paid, but which make all the difference to human happiness and flourishing....we work to live. We do not live to work. Today, I believe, we suffer from an impoverished sense of what it is to be human.'

> (Cardinal Basil Hume speaking at the Institute of Education, London, May 1994 in the submission to the Dearing inquiry of the Principals of the Catholic Higher Education Colleges of England and Wales November 1996).

16. For example, the publication of the HEQC Audit Report of Liverpool Hope University College was delayed by more than a year because the HEQC refused publicly to acknowledge the title of the institution, insisting instead on its former title Liverpool Institute of Higher Education (that which was formally recognised by the Privy Council). The tenor of the correspondence exchanged between the Principal and officials at HEQC, particularly the Chief Executive and the Assistant Director of the Audit Division HEQC, left no doubt as to the strength of feeling surrounding this issue.

17. The changes in membership of the Standing Conference of Principals over the 1990s, attracting as it has a number of mixed economy F/HE institutions, complicated its stance on the issue of institutional designation and the criteria which it proposed should define those institutions which could legitimately claim the title university college and ensured that its formal position on the University College title issue and the criteria which should be established to determine its legitimate use could not represent the interests of all its members.

18. The Higher Education Funding Council for England had published an analysis entitled *Higher Education in Further Education Colleges: Funding the Relationship.* (HEFCE, January 1995) which indicated that there was an overall lower average cost to HEFCE for higher education directly funded by the Council in further education colleges. HEFCE's analysis showed that in a number of subject areas the average unit of funding was less than half that in higher education institutions. The prospect that further expansion of higher education could prove to be more cost-effective in further education colleges clearly influenced the stances of both FEFC and CVCP in their submissions to the Dearing Committee.

19. An example of such a collaborative agreement is that between the University of Manchester and Warrington Collegiate Institute describing the affiliated status and designation University College (University of Manchester, 1993).

20. Chaired by John Lauwerys, Secretary and Registrar at Southampton University, the report of the CVCP Working Party on University College Title was considered by the CVCP Executive on 28 February 1997 and by the CVCP Council on 14 March 1997.

21. The Working Party noted that there were clearly defined criteria for the designation of a new university prescribed by government and managed by the Higher Education Quality Council (now the Quality Assurance Agency) and also recognised that a number of institutions aspired to university status and that others may follow. The Report commented

> 'This might be seen to have an implication for the adoption of University College title, which some institutions could see as an important step towards university status, although in the view of the Working Party, there was no clear link. It was noted that Government policy on the adoption of 'University' title had not changed in the last five years. In theory there could be a large number of institutions which in the fullness of time could meet the criteria for 'University' title'
>
> (CVCP, 1997b: 3).

This was an important statement, perhaps unwittingly, signifying a break with the historical pattern of institutional development which, in fact, had applied to many of the institutions represented in the Working Group itself and is reminiscent of concerns expressed by the Robbins Committee with regard to the creation of 'static' institutions which would not, by sole virtue of university college status, necessarily develop into mainstream universities. The Report did recognise, however, that the pressure for the creation of more universities was inherent in the system as a consequence of institutional aspiration.

22. One institutional submission from Liverpool Hope University College questioned the purpose of having so many representatives of the market economy on the Dearing Committee if those members did not take a robust approach to the anti-competitive forces which prevent higher education from developing freely and efficiently in a world-wide market and maintained that:

> '....the refusal of the DfEE and HEFCE to recognise university college titles is a discriminatory barrier to the free market, unlawful in domestic and European law, prejudicial to the partnership between Church and State....and obstructive to the development of international links'
>
> (Lee, 1996. Para. 3.1: 2).

The Rector and Chief Executive of Liverpool Hope University College, commenting particularly on the stance on the university college title issue, gave an account of the background of some members of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and pointed out that:

> 'The impression given by Dearing and some civil servants and journalists that 'university college' is a newly invented title is quite wrong. Sir Ron Dearing himself studied at what is now the University of Hull but which was University College Hull and David Blunkett studied at what is now the University of Sheffield but which was University College Sheffield. The University with which Liverpool Hope has close links, The University of Liverpool, began life as University College, Liverpool. The Permanent Secretary of the DfEE when the Department blocked recognition of university college titles and himself a member of the Dearing Committee, Sir Geoffrey Holland, is now Vice Chancellor of the University of Exeter which was the University College of the South West. The Chief Executive of the HEFCE, Professor Brian Fender, was Vice Chancellor of the University of Keele, which was the University College of North Staffordshire'
>
> (Lee,1996: p1).

The composition of the CVCP Working Party on University College Title (1997b) lends itself to a comparable analysis, with representatives from the University of Southampton (until 1952 a University College); the University of Manchester (formerly Owens College); the University of the

163

West of England (formerly University College, Bristol); and Queen Mary and Westfield College, a University College of the University of London.

23. As has been noted with reference to the SCOP position on this issue the composite view did not, perhaps could not, reflect the position of each individual member. Indeed, the adoption of the SCOP position would have been severely damaging to the F/HE mixed economy colleges where the preponderance of work was in the area of further education and which would therefore have been excluded by the criteria recommended from the use of the title 'university college'.

24. The Higher Education Quality Council had produced a major report entitled *Graduate Standards Programme: threshold and other academic standards.* (HEQC 1996), whose conclusions re-emphasised the complexity of defining in universal terms which could be interpreted by employers and others, the academic standards achieved by graduates at subject level, cross-institutional level, and on a sector-wide basis since little precise comparability of standards existed. Despite the detailed and lengthy research supporting the findings of the Report the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education concluded that it remained practicable to develop threshold or minimum standards which set an agreed level of expectation of awards and that this should be achieved immediately. (Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, 1997. Para. 10.64: 156).

25. This group comprised representatives of the SCOP sector which advocated, in support of its written submission to the Committee, a new legal category of institution entitled 'university college' which would recognise the group of *higher* education colleges (thereby confirming the exclusion of its members designated officially as Further Education, mixed-economy colleges, such as Warrington Collegiate Institute). This, it was argued, would reflect the true nature of these institutions; more accurately represent the quality and standards of their academic provision; rectify misperceptions among students and others who believe that such colleges are of lesser standing and quality than universities; and give explicit recognition to the concept of diversity in higher education.

26. It is interesting to compare the emerging criteria for the designation university college with the position in late Victorian England encapsulated by Armytage who comments

> *'....in the localities, initiative was not lacking. At Southampton, for instance, the council of the Hartley Institution were convinced after its twenty-five years' existence as a superior library and museum, the foundation they controlled should be expanded into a local university college. In a pamphlet entitled 'The Hartley Institution and its Proposed Extension as a Local University College' (1887) they pointed to the action of the Government in assisting the foundation of three university colleges in Wales, and announced their determination to urge on the Government the claims of various local centres in England to assistance of a similar kind....'*
>
> <div align="right">(Armytage,1955: 235).</div>

CHAPTER 5

THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGES

5.1   Introduction

The historical analysis in Chapter 3 of the thesis established the legacy of unstructured and piecemeal institutional and sector development which explains many of the current anomalies relating to University College status and title and which has precluded the systematic application in the 1990s of a consistent and widely agreed set of criteria to assess the legitimacy of the claim of individual institutions to the designation University College. It has been argued in Chapter 4 that the recommendations of the Robbins Committee in the 1960s and (particularly) those of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in 1997 and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act, 1998, relating to the use of institutional title and name, have failed (for mainly political reasons) to resolve these anomalies and the status considerations which underpinned them, and, indeed, have compounded the past failures to provide a rational structure or even to define the University College sector and its relationship to other elements of the higher education system with accuracy, consistency and equity.

This chapter, therefore, attempts to construct a 'map' of the non-university providers of higher education and will explore whether it is possible to establish a rational and consistent set of criteria which represent defining features of University Colleges. The chapter will bring into sharp focus the tensions and issues of institutional status, market

position and the fragmented nature of the sector which are set out in the earlier chapters of the thesis. In the light of the complexities of institutional and sector development established in Chapter 3, and, contrary to the definitive manner in which the committees of inquiry and the recent legislation examined in Chapter 4 have presumed a consistent view of the group of institutions which are referred to as University Colleges, this chapter highlights the difficulties of establishing clear definitional boundaries relating both to institutions and sectors, and examines the extent to which the title University College describes, in an exclusive and distinctive manner, the series of relationships with the university sector.

The chapter seeks to explore, in a manner not undertaken by the Committees of Inquiry, the logic, consistency and legitimacy of the differential usage of the designation 'University College' and will demonstrate the confusion of status and title which exists and the variation in the range of institutional relationships (and the terms used to describe them) which characterise the work of a significant number of institutions across the further and higher education sectors. The analysis will also show that the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and, indeed, the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, have failed to recognise the complexity of the nature, form and structure of higher education beyond the universities and, consequently, have failed to create the basis of a consistent, clear and equitable set of criteria to distinguish those institutions with a legitimate claim to the title University College. The analysis will also demonstrate that the criteria adopted serve to perpetuate rather than remove anomalies and inequities in institutional status.

A range of submissions to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and, indeed the Committee itself, distinguished elements of the university college sector without being explicit about its composition, size, shape and its role in providing important opportunities for the study of higher education in the non-university sector. Judgements as to the value of the contribution of university colleges to: higher education; widening participation and access to higher levels of study; enhancing their local communities; providing a continuum of educational opportunity at a range of different levels; vocationalism; the successful implementation of the Government's commitment to education and training; and supporting the further planned growth in student enrolments in higher education, require a clear understanding of the nature of these institutions and the diversity of profile, academic provision, allegiances and organisational forms they represent. This provides a key justification for the case study which follows in Chapter 6 of the study.

In attempting to identify the university colleges which, as a group, are referred to in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Teaching and Higher Education Act which has sought to implement its recommendations in respect of institutional title, it is confusion rather than (the more defensible) diversity which predominates. The central difficulty in defending and promoting the concept of diversity as a fundamental principle determining the structural development of the higher education sector (1) is the ease with which the concept has become associated, by those seeking to

misrepresent the term, with the confusions of sector position and institutional status which continue to confound attempts to rationalise the categories of institutional types.

Of itself, the absence of a clear statement of those institutions which constitute the group of university colleges is significant, though not easily explainable. Despite the substantial research capacity and expertise of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and that of the DfEE in framing the legislation, it has remained unclear throughout the debate precisely which institutions, categorically and definitively, form part of the group of institutions which are considered by their inappropriate use of institutional titles and/or names to be, at best, confusing the sector and its domestic and overseas client groups or, at worst, in breach of the legal constraints and authority of the Privy Council whose specific approval is required for institutional *titles* and the status which they imply (in contrast to institutional *names* which may be changed to the extent that such changes do not imply a change in status).

There are numerous possible explanations for this lack of a definitive framework for the university college sector. It has been suggested that in view of the massive and politically sensitive agenda with which the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education was charged, the issue of university college title was insignificant in the broader context of, for example, the relationship of education and training to the wider economy or the introduction of student tuition fees. (2) The issue, it is argued, therefore warranted (and received) scant attention in the deliberations of the Dearing Inquiry and it had been deemed unnecessary, despite the portentous recommendations relating to institutional title, to

engage in preliminary research to identify precisely those institutions affected. In view of the extensive research undertaken on behalf of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education to establish the current higher education landscape, (3) this is implausible.

In the context of the DfEE role in the drafting of the legislation and the Commencement Order which implemented those elements of the legislation relating to restrictions on the use of institutional title, the absence of such a definitive list of affected organisations with a clear typology is a more significant omission, indicating that the confusions of sector and institutional status represented a series of unapproachable difficulties and sensitivities which the legislation itself, in part at least, was designed to eradicate.

More conspiratorially, the DfEE may have set out to reflect the will of the Government, some members of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and, indeed, some elements of the higher education sector, by framing the legislation in a manner which protected and preserved the status of those institutions which held federated status within the framework of the University of London or University of Wales, and left unthreatened the protected status of the University Colleges within the traditional collegiate structures of Oxford, Cambridge and Durham, whilst 'targeting' a number of non-university higher education providers and, particularly institutions within the further education sector which, regardless of the legitimacy of their case, were deemed to have assumed the title university college without formal authority. (4) To this extent, it was therefore necessary not merely to have a clear view of those institutions whose status the legislation was intended to change but also those which, it was intended, should remain unaffected. In the event, the

timing of the introduction of the Commencement Order relating to Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act and the delay in the publication by the Quality Assurance Agency of the criteria for the assessment of applications for degree-awarding powers, intentionally or otherwise, placed a number of non-university higher education institutions in a dilemma. (5)

Notwithstanding the nature of the explanation of the absence of a clear and shared understanding of which institutions comprised the university college sector, the consequence was necessarily to preclude an accurate assessment of the implications of the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the subsequent legislation for all the institutions affected. It is important, therefore, in the context of this study that an attempt is made to construct a map of the university college sector. This will serve to demonstrate the extent to which the historical development of the sector and individual institutions within it, has bequeathed a legacy of confusion and complexity which required at the outset of the investigations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education the establishment of a clear, well-defined framework of institutions based on agreed and widely recognised criteria. The Committee's failure to grasp this complexity and the predominance of political and status considerations in its investigation evidenced by the nature of the range of institutional and agency submissions in the consultation period examined in Chapter 4, has served to undermine the validity of its recommendations regarding the legitimate use of the University College title and casts doubt on the consistent applicability of those aspects of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 relating to institutional title.

5.2   Issues in Constructing The Map of the Sector

It is immediately evident that the existing sector maps fail accurately or distinctly to delineate, less still define, those institutions which are described as university colleges, the sub-set of higher education providers at which Recommendation 65 of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and Sections 39 and 40 of the 1998 legislation were specifically targeted.   The process which has sought to identify this group of institutions has reaffirmed the elusive nature of a definitive typology.

Four factors have contributed particularly to this elusiveness but have simultaneously confirmed the importance of constructing an accurate map of the university college sector. These are: nonconformance; non-recognition; the absence of definitive criteria; and the inconsistent use of terminology.

5.2.1   Nonconformance

The university college sector is not coterminous with any single existing grouping of institutions described in published documentation.   An examination of the existing lists of education providers demonstrates the extent to which the university colleges are a complex amalgam of organisations which exhibit widely-differing characteristics and which do not conform to any category of institutions or typology but rather, dependent on the classification criteria adopted, transcend several sets of sector boundaries.   There are numerous sets of categories and listings from a range of sources all of which, for diverse

reasons, fail to provide a comprehensive statement of the *(de facto* if not *de jure)* position of the university college sector.

The immediate source of definitive authority on the legitimacy of institutional designations is the DfEE, as the Government Department responsible for the management of the education sector. Clearly, the comments relating to the perceived misuse of institutional names and titles in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (6) were based upon reference to those institutional designations formally recognised and approved by the Privy Council, the position upheld by the DfEE.

This formal position is set out in two Statutory Instruments: *1997 No. 1, The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997* which provides a schedule of all universities, colleges or other bodies which are authorised under Royal Charter or by or under Act of Parliament to grant degrees and other bodies for the time being permitted by the aforementioned bodies to act on their behalf in the granting of degrees; (7) and *1997 No. 54, The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997* (8) which lists the name of each body which is not a recognised body within section 214 (2) (a) or (b) of the Education Reform Act 1988 but which either provides any course which is in preparation for a degree to be granted by such a body and is approved by or on behalf of that body; or is a constituent college, school, hall or other institution of a university which is such a recognised body.

However, reference to these schedules, whilst providing the official formal position adopted by the DfEE, leads to a self-fulfilling legal justification for the continuing denial

of the *de facto* position of the university colleges. It is precisely the nature of Royal Charter powers and their use in relation to other institutions which is at the heart of the debate. (9) In this instance, the anticipated definitive source of information on university colleges is precisely the primary point of contention.

Equally, the information provided by a range of sector-wide agencies is partial. For example, since not all institutions bearing the designation University College are classified as higher education institutions, the lists based on the institutional membership of the Higher Education Funding Council for England do not accurately or comprehensively identify the university colleges. Similarly, a number of University Colleges have not traditionally been part of the quality assurance arrangements administered by the Higher Education Quality Council (now the Quality Assurance Agency) and therefore reference to the list of auditable higher education institutions would exclude the further education corporations which bear the designation University College. Again, whilst many of the university colleges are members of the Standing Conference of Principals (established as the higher education colleges' equivalent of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals), reference to its membership lists do not show all those institutions currently referred to as university colleges since a number of these institutions are further education corporations, and, in any event, membership of this organisation is optional, by subscription. (10) Organisations such as the Council of Church and Associated Colleges (CCAC) contain many institutions which are referred to as university colleges, although clearly the nature of this body, representing the Church College sector, excludes the many secular colleges employing the university college designation. The Further Education

Funding Council institutional listings also contain reference to a number of institutions which are known to bear the designation University College but, clearly since a defining feature of university colleges is the links with higher education this does not offer a suitable or complete source of reference. Furthermore, whilst a number of institutions which bear the designation are part of a federal relationship with a University this category includes those institutions which have traditionally borne the title but excludes the substantial majority of existing university colleges, indeed precisely those institutions whose questionable status appears to be the focus of the legislation.

5.2.2 Non-Recognition

Secondly, and related, since many official sources, particularly the DfEE, the Higher Education Funding Council, the (former) Higher Education Quality Council and its successor body, the Quality Assurance Agency, and the Further Education Funding Council, have declined to recognise in formal documentation the existence of the university colleges, (11) the map of the sector cannot be drawn exclusively and reliably merely from the aggregation of the official sources which, for a range of different functions or purposes (e.g. quality or funding), exercise a policy, managerial or co-ordinating role across the further and higher education sectors.

Therefore, while the list of those bodies in receipt of HEFCE funds contains all those independently-funded institutions which *de facto* use the designation University College, or by some other means associate themselves with the university sector, since the HEFCE does not officially recognise the title university college and does not refer in published

documentation to the designation except in those particular instances where Privy Council approval has been granted, the researcher cannot derive the list of university colleges from the list of funded bodies, but rather is required to take pre-existing (and without the evidence of the investigation which follows, partial) knowledge of the university college sector to the HEFCE list. (12) To that extent these official sources are framed within a political context which supports a predetermined stance on this issue which serves to deny the existence of university colleges beyond the legal definition based on Privy Council approval. Nor, of course, do the HEFCE recurrent funding lists contain reference to institutions federated to a university but not separately funded and full account needs to be taken of these organisations since legally they form part of the university college sector.

5.2.3 The Absence of Definitive Criteria

Thirdly, from the point of view of the researcher attempting to formulate sets of common characteristics which might define a university college, there are no accepted or universally agreed criteria which would enable institutions to be attributed unequivocally to the university college sector. Indeed, institutions which exhibit significant, common characteristics are not consistent in adopting the designation university college and it should not be assumed that features which apply to a series of institutions will inevitably be reflected in a common approach to institutional title. Furthermore, it is essential to avoid prematurely constructing universally applicable criteria to enable institutions with similar characteristics to be aggregated, since the criteria which may be used to distinguish institutions are based, by definition, upon a range of preconceptions which may relate to size, profile, or funding sources whose validity in determining the legitimacy of an

175

institution's use of the University College title is disputed by the DfEE and a range of sector agencies, including the HEFCE and the Quality Assurance Agency.

5.2.4 Inconsistent Terminology

Fourthly, a principal source of difficulty, and one which superficially at least justifies the expressions of concern encapsulated in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, relates to the inconsistency in the terminology used to describe institutions and the continuing confusion which it generates. This stems primarily from issues regarding their corporate status, the sector to which they belong, and in some cases the nature and level of education and training which they provide. In numerous instances across the higher education sector, (often for reasons of the marketing advantage deriving from a pre-existing, more widely-recognised institutional title) institutions have retained or adopted designations other than University College despite the fact that their position in the sector and particularly their relationship with their validating or accrediting university corresponds directly to that of other institutions which are utilising the University College title. (13)   Such institutions are, arguably, no less part of the university college sector.

Finally, a major complicating factor in the construction of a map of the university college sector relates to the nature of the definitions and usage of the terms which are employed to describe the extensive and varying forms of relationship between the universities and the range of non-university higher education providers which are in direct receipt of HEFCE funding.   Collaborative arrangements take many forms variously described at the institutional level as accreditation, institutional validation and association; and at academic

programme level as articulation, franchising, (14) joint programmes and validation. The complexity of these various forms of collaboration is compounded by the use of identical terms to describe significantly different arrangements and, conversely, the use of different terms to describe identical arrangements (Rhodes, 1996).

The most profound confusion arises because the various descriptors are not used within a common frame of reference. The most significant feature of such definitions, for the purposes of this analysis, is not whether they apply to institutional or programme level arrangements but whether the terms describe the nature and form of a relationship or merely the fact that a relationship exists.

Essentially, one set of terms, validation and accreditation (representing a progressive route to independent academic authority possibly culminating in degree-awarding powers for a particular institution), though not consistently used, most clearly describes the detailed operational basis upon which a relationship is founded, its defining characteristics and the regulations which govern the arrangements. These categories, as descriptions of formal institutional agreements, are mutually exclusive (although an accreditation agreement will, necessarily, have at its core the validation of individual programmes by the awarding authority) and therefore should be readily distinguishable. Validation refers to an arrangement whereby a programme developed and taught in a partner institution leads to an award made by the awarding body under the *aegis* of that awarding body (Rhodes 1996). In validation agreements, the judgements relating to validation and review are made exclusively by the awarding body. Accreditation describes arrangements in which

the providing institution has some form of delegated authority for the management and operation of the quality assurance arrangements in which

> '....the awarding institution accords to the providing institution the maximum possible responsibility for academic standards consistent with the requirements of quality assurance and the regulations...of the awarding institution. The precise terms of accreditation may vary...(but)...the means by which the monitoring and review are conducted, and how these processes articulate with the oversight of academic standards by the awarding institution , would be covered.... '
>
> (Council of Validating Universities, 1996: Para. 8.4 and 8.6)

The basis of accreditation is expressed most clearly by the definition provided by the Higher Education Quality Council in which, typically, an accredited institution, whose internal quality assurance processes will have been subject to general approval by the accrediting institution, is authorised to validate and approve programmes, and to exercise delegated powers in the management of quality, subject to annual or other periodic reporting requirements. Even in this most consistent and well-documented area of collaboration, however, it is evident that there is no single national model of institutional accreditation and, in practice, accredited institutions may exercise different powers and responsibilities (Higher Education Quality Council, 1996).

The second set of terms is still less precise in definition, meaning and usage. Affiliation, association, and importantly, the title university college, describe the fact that a relationship exists between two institutions but not necessarily, by definition, its nature and form. These terms are used interchangeably (15) and constitute an essential confusion regarding institutional title and name since it is the affiliated and associate college status in

178

its many guises, and however ill-defined, which has strengthened the connection of non-university higher education providers to the university sector. This has enabled many non-university higher education institutions, with the tacit consent of their parent universities, to use the university college title without a formal written agreement, (16) and, as previously shown, allowed others, whilst not actually using the university college title, to reflect their status as affiliated or associated institutions in a 'strap-line' which refers to ' a university sector college'. (17)

In these particular instances, as with the university colleges as a group, the meaning of the title in demonstrating the precise nature and form of a collaborative agreement is unclear, particularly the extent to which it equates to a validation or accreditation arrangement as defined, and in the case of the three further education institutions cited, the significance of the title for the institutions concerned undoubtedly varies. It is evident, however, that the essential problem does not simply rest with terminology and its inconsistent usage (although these confusions compound the problem since they supposedly reflect the nature and extent of the 'status drift' that prompted both government ministers and parts of the higher education sector to react to the perceived misrepresentation of the university college title) but with the political considerations relating to the impact upon the existing pattern of higher education provision and the respective status of institutional providers.

5.3   The Approach to Sector Definition

The combination of these factors confounded initial attempts to construct an accurate map of the university college sector from existing official sources and an alternative approach

was adopted based on the concept of inclusivity. In the absence of reliable or complete official lists of institutions currently employing the title University College (and in order to ensure that this survey captured all institutions so designated, regardless of the political agenda and avoiding the imposition of disputed criteria), it was necessary to adopt the principle of *self-designation* as the basis of the sector map. Recognising that this approach, in itself, may reveal some inconsistencies and may generate some difficulties and (possibly unintended) exclusions, this was the most effective means of demonstrating the confusions which currently affect institutional titles and status.

Whilst maintaining the principle of inclusivity based upon self-designation, initial investigations indicated that three sets of defining characteristics could be established as general search parameters without compromising (indeed, supporting) the requirement for consistency and completeness.

First, it was necessary in the interests of completeness to identify all institutions considered *eligible* to use the title and not simply focus upon those institutions whose use of the title was in dispute. Although not specified in the report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education or the 1998 Teaching and Higher Education Act, the criteria established served explicitly to define (though not name) a set of institutions which, post-February 1999, clearly formed an approved part of the university college sector. It was important to identify these institutions in a manner not achieved by the Report itself.

Secondly, however, within this all-encompassing approach, and in order to establish clear boundaries between categories of institutions, the search excluded all non-university higher education institutions (but not the designated institutions of a federal university) and further education colleges which were not in direct receipt of HEFCE funding, and therefore in the process removed from the analysis all further education corporations without directly-funded higher education provision. This removed from the equation the substantial and complex (but in this context, irrelevant) series of franchise agreements which exist between further education corporations and higher education institutions and all instances in which an element of the Maximum Aggregated Student Number (refer to page 85) allocated to a University had simply been transferred to a further education institution to enable growth or recruitment targets to be met. [18]

Thirdly, it was necessary to recognise that for a variety of legal and political reasons some institutions have not employed the University College title but, in order to optimise the marketing advantage which association with the university sector affords, have used a range of subordinate descriptions, or 'strap-lines' (subsidiary descriptors attaching to institutional title or name) which have referred variously to their status as 'A University Sector College' or 'A College in the University Sector'; or have otherwise in an explicit statement made reference to their formal relationship with a University. [19] To the institutions concerned this form of descriptor accurately conveyed to their range of client groups the level of educational provision. To successive Secretaries of State this means of implying university status for these institutions represented unacceptable status drift,

misrepresenting the nature of the institutions, and as such, formed an important element in the debate.   ,

In attempting to construct the map of the University College sector this final distinction is important.   Many institutions, particularly (but not exclusively) further education corporations, stress their association with a particular university.   Such association may take a range of forms and the inclusion in a map of the University Colleges, *qua* sector, of all institutions thus described would detract from the definitional clarity required.   This approach therefore excludes those further education institutions which simply allude to an association with a university without further specific reference to the university college title or university sector status.   Since this would require the inclusion of numerous further education colleges which do not otherwise claim to be part of the university college sector, the predominant criterion has been that referred to previously which relates to the inclusion of only those institutions in direct receipt of HEFCE funding.   It is clear, however, that the contentious and complex categorisation of institutional relationships according to the degree of academic ownership of the programmes concerned - essentially the nature of the various validation and accreditation relationships between colleges (in both the further and higher education sectors) and universities - is an important issue and source of potential anomaly and confusion which requires further consideration later in this chapter.

The parameters are designed to achieve inclusivity.   Therefore, initially, all institutions falling within any of the sets of parameters are included in the outline map of the sector,. Following the principle of *self-designation* in order to avoid the application of contested

criteria (or a predetermined political view on the title issue), this approach is able to capture, from the broadest base, all institutions involved in the provision of higher education which refer to themselves, are referred to as university colleges, or have a specified, formal relationship with a university involving validation or accreditation arrangements, or are part of a federal university.

In that context, the establishment of these parameters enables the outline composition of the university college sector to be derived from several, cross-referenced sources: two Statutory Instruments; *1997 No. 1 The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997*; and *1997 No. 54 The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997*; the tables of HEFCE funding allocations for 1998/99; [20] showing the total resources for higher education programmes in the universities and the non-university higher education institutions which are further categorised as General Colleges and Specialist Institutions; and the comparable table of HEFCE funding allocations to Further Education Colleges for higher education programmes.

An inclusive grouping is achieved by cross-referencing the above-noted sources with institutionally-generated information from Web-sites, marketing and promotional material (notably prospectuses), SCOP and UCAS listings. [21] Clearly, in the initial stages, instances arise where institutions are included in the map of the sector by virtue of conforming to one set of parameters despite being specifically excluded by the strict application of another. For example, one such instance relates to the inclusion of those institutions which are part of a federal university structure, although are neither referred to

as a university college nor separately funded by the HEFCE. Wherever such anomalies and inconsistencies arise the principle of inclusivity has been applied initially although such instances highlight an existing definitional vagueness which this study seeks ultimately to clarify.

The three sector categories which frame the following analysis therefore include institutions which are part of federal universities (and in some cases are, of themselves, regarded as universities); the higher education colleges which are described as being attached to a university by virtue of arrangements which, at least by implication, extend beyond (but may include) validation or accreditation agreements (or other formal association), and those higher education colleges with taught degree-awarding powers; and the further education colleges whose higher education programmes are funded separately by the HEFCE and whose formal association with a university involves a validation or accreditation relationship. This sector-based analysis takes account of the artificiality and, in many cases, randomness of the manner in which these institutions have adopted or become recognised by a particular title (without prejudice to its validity or legitimacy in its respective contexts) and demonstrates that the problems of definitional clarity resulting from the unstructured approach to institutional and sector development have affected (in different ways and to different degrees) the three sectors considered here.

5.4   The Map of the University College Sector

In view of the framework of issues set out in the preceding discussion, the following section attempts to map the University College sector.

5.4.1 Federal Universities

The recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 confirm the legality of the university college title (where institutions choose to use it) when applied to those institutions which are part of a federal university structure. To that extent this sector category would appear to represent the least contentious grouping since their status is unquestioned. However, whilst all institutions in this category therefore potentially form part of the initial map of the sector, there are many (often historically-derived) anomalies and confusions remaining in this sector which the application of the above-noted parameters clarify but do not resolve.

5.4.1.1 University of London

Reference to the Statutory *Instrument 1997 No1, The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997* (SI/1) shows that, in addition to the (university and non-university institutions) with independent degree-awarding powers, there are a number of Schools, Colleges and Institutes of the University of London which are permitted by the University to award University of London degrees. These institutions, which are appended to the Order as a separate list from the main universities, are referred to as

> '....other bodies for the time being permitted by the aforementioned bodies to act on their behalf in the granting of degrees.'

(DfEE, 1997(c): Explanatory Note).

All of the institutions cited in this section of the above-noted Statutory Instrument (Appendix 1: Table 1) are in what is deemed to be a federal relationship with the

185

University of London and therefore are, in the strictest sense of the term, university colleges and could in theory, if they chose, legitimately use the University College designation. Based on the criteria proposed in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act, these twenty-four institutions are regarded as '...*constituent institutions of the University of London*' (DfEE, 1997c) and are eligible for inclusion in the university college sector map. However, only fifteen of these institutions [Appendix1: Table 1(a)] are separately funded by the HEFCE. Of the twenty-four institutions referred to in this Schedule, sixteen are listed in the UCAS Directory, enabling prospective students to apply directly rather than through a central admissions process managed by the university. However, this list of sixteen institutions [Appendix 1: Table 1(b)] does not contain all those institutions which are separately funded since a number in this latter category are predominantly providers of part-time or postgraduate education and are therefore fall beyond the UCAS domain. Confusingly, the University of London is shown in the HEFCE Recurrent Funding Lists 1998/99 not as a University but as a 'Specialist Institution'.

In addition to these considerations, University College London is the sole institution within the federation which uses the terms 'university' and 'college' in its title.

These residual difficulties of institutional type and form have their origins in the historical development of the University of London, confirming the complex history and legacy of sector development and contributing to the current unresolved issues of status and sector

position. This echoes the analysis in Chapter 3 of the thesis in which the attempt to create a rational structure from the early stages of the development of the University of London, was a problem described as '..*the most complex that has ever presented itself in academic history......*' (Thomas, 1973: 20) and which, to a considerable extent, remains unresolved.

5.4.1.2   *Other Federal Universities*

The Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54 The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997 lists the name of each body which is not a recognised body within Section 214(2) (a) or (b) of the Education Reform Act 1988 but which either:

- provides any course which is in preparation for a degree to be granted by such a recognised body and is approved by or on behalf of that body; or

- is a constituent college, school, hall or other institution of a university which is such a recognised body.

Part II of the Statutory Instrument lists eleven federal universities. Within the federal structure of these eleven universities there are one hundred and forty-two constituent colleges, schools, halls or other institutions [Appendix 1: Table 2].

As previously, in the case of the University of London (that is, disregarding whether the constituent bodies of these eleven federal universities employ the university college title or receive HEFCE funding independently of the university), since all institutions listed in Appendix 1: Table 2 are described in *The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997* as 'Institutions of a University', logic and consistency demand that all must be considered for inclusion, at least initially.

However, many of these refer to residential/collegiate arrangements within the universities concerned and for the purposes of mapping the university college sector may be disregarded (although these constituent colleges, schools, halls, or other institutions are implicitly eligible, that is not specifically excluded by the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, to adopt the title University College). Utilising the UCAS Directory to identify those Colleges to which students may make separate entry within these federal structures, the initial one hundred and forty two institutions reduces potentially to eight-one, [Appendix 1: Table 2(a)] comprising: twenty-nine Colleges of Cambridge University; twelve Colleges of the University of Durham; two institutions of the University of London (in addition to those twenty-four institutions identified above which are permitted by the University of London to award degrees on its behalf); thirty Colleges of the University of Oxford (excluding the six Permanent Private Halls); and eight Colleges of the University of Wales. The collegiate arrangements of the University of Kent at Canterbury, the University of Lancaster, the University of St. Andrews, and the University of York appear primarily to serve residential rather than academic purposes and may, therefore, be excluded.

From this Schedule of 'Institutions of a University' from The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997 Part II, numerous anomalies and confusions relating both to entries and omissions arise requiring further explanation.

First, the Schedule contains reference to Brunel University College (as an institution of Brunel University) which since 1997 has been an integral part of Brunel University. This institution no longer exists as an independent entity. Its inclusion in this form may simply relate to the timing of the publication of the Schedule.

Secondly, the twenty-nine Colleges of the University of Cambridge which are listed in the Schedule and have separate UCAS codes (and, therefore, some form of independent existence beyond the residential/collegiate structure) includes Homerton College which is, in fact, separate from the School of Education of the University of Cambridge and which not only has a separate admissions process but is also separately funded by the HEFCE, being described in the Recurrent Funding Lists for 1998/99 as a Specialist Institution. At postgraduate level (PGCE), teaching is undertaken either at the University School of Education or at Homerton College, depending on the particular subject specialism. Of the original thirty-one Colleges and Halls associated with Cambridge University cited in the Schedule (from which Clare Hall and Darwin College are excluded by virtue of not appearing in the UCAS Directory), none employs the title University College, although meeting the criteria established by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education for the use of the title by virtue of being a constituent part of a federal University.

In the case of the University of Durham, of the fifteen Colleges described as 'Institutions of the University' in the Schedule, none is separately funded, though twelve [Appendix 1; Table 2(a)] have independent UCAS entries, the exceptions being: Ushaw College; the

189

Graduate Society; and University College, Stockton. In the latter case, according to the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, the title would be deemed to be legitimate since the College is considered to be an integral part of the federal structure of the University. (22) Similarly, University College, Durham is regarded as a legitimate descriptor for a separate College within the federal university structure. In the case of the University of Durham, therefore, there are two institutions identified in Part II of the Schedule of The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997 which, at the time of its publication, employed the University College title.

Thirdly, in the case of the University of London several more categories of institutions appear in the Schedule, described variously and imprecisely as 'Institutes of the University'; 'Associate Institutions'; and 'Other Institutions affiliated/associated with the Colleges of the University'. In the first category the British Institute in Paris appears, an organisation which has a separate entry in the UCAS Directory but which is not funded separately by HEFCE. The Jews' College which, again, has a separate entry in the UCAS Directory but which is not funded independently by HEFCE is described as an Associate Institution, and also within this category are The Royal Academy of Music, which offers joint degrees with King's College London, and Trinity College of Music, whose BMus degree is validated by the University of Westminster and MMus degree is validated by the University of Sussex. These two latter 'Associate Institutions' are funded separately from the University of London. None of the institutions cited in Part II of the Schedule of The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997 as Institutions of the University of London is referred to as a university college although, again, those described as Institutes of the

190

University fulfil the criteria set out in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.

Fourthly, the Manchester Business School is listed as an institution of the University of Manchester but does not appear as a separate entry in the UCAS Directory and, unlike the London Business School, is not funded separately by HEFCE.

Fifthly, an interesting omission from this Schedule is the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST). Described as a University in the HEFCE Recurrent Funding Lists 1998/99, the University of Manchester relationship with UMIST is described in detail in Regulation XV of the University Calendar (University of Manchester, 1998). Following a petition to the Privy Council in 1994 UMIST has the power to award degrees but the Regulations governing the relationship between UMIST and the University of Manchester confirm that

> 'UMIST will not exercise this power in relation to undergraduate and postgraduate degrees for so long as the arrangements set out in this agreement are deemed to be working to the mutual benefit of both universities'
>
> (University of Manchester, 1998, Regulation XV 2[b]: 131).

This facility, to gain approval but not exercise the right to award degrees, is precisely the arrangement which has been denied to institutions seeking degree awarding powers since 1995. The policy of the Higher Education Quality Council (and now the Quality Assurance Agency) is that a condition of the granting of degree-awarding powers is that

the institution concerned will be required to use the powers independently of other higher education institutions. (23)

The University of Manchester Regulations further refer to the responsibility for all academic matters concerning its students and the teaching of courses residing with UMIST but affirm that

> '....ultimately the University of Manchester can withdraw....its
> 'recognition' of UMIST if it finds unacceptable the manner in which
> UMIST has exercised the University of Manchester's power to award
> degrees'

> (University of Manchester, 1998,
> Regulation XV 4[d]: 132).

Sixthly, of the thirty-nine Colleges listed in the Schedule as institutions of the University of Oxford, thirty have separate UCAS entries (this excludes All Souls College; Green College; Kellogg College; Linacre College; Nuffield College; St. Anthony's College; St. Cross College; Templeton College; and Wolfson College). None of these institutions is funded separately by HEFCE and one institution is referred to as University College, Oxford.

Finally, in the case of the University of Wales there are eight institutions listed in the Schedule as part of the federation. Each has a separate UCAS Directory entry and is funded separately by the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW). Five of the institutions are referred to as 'the University of Wales' followed by the location of the institution (for example, Aberystwyth or Lampeter); one, University of Wales College of

Medicine refers to the academic subject, and two are referred to by location but also employ the University College title – University College of North Wales (Bangor) and University of Wales College, Newport.

It might have been anticipated that the issue of the legitimate use of the university college title would be relatively uncontentious in the university sector since the main thrust of the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, it is argued, were intended to preserve and protect the existing models of the federal, collegiate universities.   However, as is evident from the foregoing analysis, the anomalies and confusions abound and neither the Dearing Report nor the subsequent legislation have clarified the position.

At one extreme, taking the information from the Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997 (SI/1) which provides a supplementary list of (24) Schools, Colleges and Institutes of the University of London, and the Education (Listed Bodies) Order (SI/54) which identifies (142) organisations which are described as 'Institutions of a University', the university colleges (as defined within the terms of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education) within the university sector could number one hundred and sixty-six.   With the identical information and the strict application of the formal, legal eligibility criteria, this number reduces to seven: University College London; University College Durham; University College Stockton (Durham); University College Oxford; the University College of North Wales; the University of Wales College of Medicine and University of Wales College, Newport.

The crucial factors in determining an appropriate mid-point between these extreme positions are the application of clear, undisputed criteria to classify the university sector institutions referred to above, and an interpretation of the university sector groups to which the recommendations of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 were intended to apply. This shows that even *within* the university sector the confusions and anomalies of title and status abound with the relationships between universities and their constituent colleges being described variously and inconsistently. In the wider context of the higher and further education colleges involved in the provision of higher education these issues become yet more complex.

5.4.2   Higher Education Colleges

Part I of the Schedule to the Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997 (SI/54) lists those institutions (221) which: provide courses leading to a degree; are not part of a recognised body (unlike the institutions in Part II of the Schedule); and have their degrees granted by a recognised body (that is, one of the institutions named in the Education [Recognised Bodies] Order 1997 Statutory Instrument 1997/1). This list includes reference to the higher education colleges (58) which do not have independent degree-awarding powers, and further education colleges (72), both of which groups receive funding directly from the HEFCE for their higher education work. (The remaining ninety-one institutions are a complex amalgam of different types of institutions with a range of levels of provision which make no reference to the university college title nor claim a relationship either

through title or implied association with the university sector and therefore, for these purposes, may be discounted).

In view of the parameter set for this study relating to independent HEFCE funding, a parallel source of information is the HEFCE table of Recurrent Grant for the Academic Year 1998/99 (HEFCE, 1999) which lists fifty-eight higher education colleges in direct receipt of HEFCE funds for their higher education provision and are classified as General Colleges and Specialist Institutions (Appendix 1: Table 3). Institutions within this group represent the core of the university college sector and, indeed, since the basis of their use of institutional titles and names provide many of the anomalies and supposed misdescriptions which have concerned successive Secretaries of State and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, and which Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education sought to address, this group requires more detailed consideration.

Of the fifty-eight institutions listed, thirteen [Appendix 1: Table 3(a)] may be immediately excluded from this analysis since they are either independent university institutions which make no reference to the University College title, or are Colleges within a federal university (normally the University of London, or in one case, Homerton College, the University of Cambridge) which have been considered in the previous category.

Of the remaining forty-five, sixteen institutions [Appendix 1: Table 3(b)] are involved in arts education. Some of these have validation and accreditation arrangements with a range of universities and have traditionally marketed their courses on the basis of their long-

195

standing reputation. Therefore, although many of these institutions refer to their links with the relevant university, (24) their particular concern is to emphasise not the *level* of education which the term 'university college' conveys, but the *nature* of the education provided, such as art and design, music, dance or drama. Other institutions within this category refer to a range of collaborative links with universities, for example, the academic programmes of the Royal Northern College of Music are validated by the University of Manchester with which there are also, in certain instances, joint admission arrangements to limit the intake and provide dual certification. (25) Some institutions have taught degree awarding powers, for example Surrey Institute of Art and Design and Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication. None of this group of sixteen institutions employs the University College title directly but one institution, Dartington College of Arts, refers to its status as a university sector college and therefore, for consistency, should be included in the sector map (despite institutions with similar profiles being excluded) - thereby highlighting one of a series of increasingly evident anomalies relating to institutional titles and sector status; and a second, Rose Bruford College, describes itself as a 'University Sector College' which despite being a London-based institution is, in fact, an affiliated institution (but *not* a University College) of the University of Manchester.

Of the remaining twenty-nine institutions, nineteen [Appendix1: Table 3 (c)] carried the words 'University College' explicitly in their title prior to 1 February 1999. (26)

Of the remaining ten institutions [Appendix 1: Table 3(d)] from this category: three, Bolton Institute of Higher Education, Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher

Education, and Southampton Institute have independent degree-awarding powers (indeed in the first two cases have made application for full university status) and, although this factor does not distinguish them from a number of those nineteen institutions in the previous category, these institutions make no reference to the university college title (and therefore may be excluded from this analysis). One, the Roehampton Institute, despite having taught and research degree-awarding powers is described as an Institute of the University of Surrey and, indeed, intends not to seek independent university status but, rather, to form a federation with the University of Surrey on 1 January 2000. (27) Two, Newman College of Higher Education and Westhill College of Higher Education are 'sister' institutions which are described as university sector colleges affiliated to, and accredited by the University of Birmingham. One, Chichester Institute of Higher Education is referred to as 'a College of the University of Southampton'; one, Westminster College Oxford (UK), funded separately by HEFCE and whose programmes are validated variously by the University of Oxford and, in some cases, by the Open University Validation Services, does not refer specifically to university college title or status and is not otherwise directly associated with Oxford University (and therefore may be excluded). One, the College of Guidance Studies is a small specialist college funded by the HEFCE whose programmes are focused on education, training, research and development in the guidance services validated by a range of bodies including the Local Government Management Board and the Open University Validation Services and similarly, this institution makes no reference to university college title or status (and may be excluded). Finally, one, the Royal College of Nursing Institute, whose reputation and specialist provision (as in the cases of institutions providing arts education) is reflected in

197

its title but which, in fact, is a formal University College of the University of Manchester, prescribed by the Charter of the University in precisely the same terms as two further education institutions detailed in the third sector category below. (28)

In this group of fifty-eight higher education institutions which are independently funded the principle of inclusivity, using the broadest definitional base, would justify the use of the university college title in twenty-six instances.   This excludes those thirteen institutions which have been considered elsewhere as either independent institutions or which are part of a federal university structure [Appendix 1: Table 3(a)] and a further nineteen institutions which merely make reference to validation or accreditation agreements with a particular university but do not use the university college title or the university sector college 'strap-line'. (This figure comprises fourteen of the sixteen 'arts' colleges, Bolton Institute of Higher Education, Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education, Southampton Institute Westminster College as three independent institutions not attached to a university, Westminster College, Oxford (UK) and the College of Guidance Studies).   Further refinement, establishing a category strictly limited to those institutions which specifically utilise the university college title, reduces this figure of twenty-six to nineteen.

Within this categorisation, therefore, there are numerous inconsistencies and anomalies in which the nature of an institution and its relationship to a particular university (or to the sector) is often not reflected in its title.   In the case of the 'arts' colleges, for example, Rose Bruford and Dartington College of Arts make reference to being university sector

colleges whilst the remaining fourteen institutions in this category involved in arts education merely allude to validation and accreditation arrangements with universities which, in practice, correspond to the arrangements applying to these two institutions. Chichester Institute of Higher Education was (until January 1999) described as a College of the University of Southampton rather than, as other institutions in an identical position, as a University College. The Royal College of Nursing Institute (RCNI), whilst not employing the title for reasons associated with the nature of the education provided and the reputation of the institution signified by its title, nonetheless has the formal status of a University College of the University of Manchester.

Furthermore, as discussed previously, the policy of a range of official bodies (DfEE, HEFCE the former HEQC and the QAA) is to acknowledge in published documentation only those titles which have formal Privy Council approval. Therefore, reference to the Statutory Instruments or to HEFCE Recurrent Funding Lists does not reveal the detail of recent, unapproved, changes to institutional title where these are not immediately evident from the pre-existing title. (29) For example, Liverpool Hope University College is referred to as Liverpool Institute of Higher Education (although there is a recent agreement that the official title to be used by the HEFCE is Liverpool Hope); Bath Spa University College as Bath College of Higher Education; Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College as Buckinghamshire College of Higher Education. In most instances despite the reference to university college in their titles such organisations remain identifiable. However, there is one instance of an institution which, without close knowledge of the sector and this issue, would not be readily identifiable since the formal published sources refer to North Riding

College whereas the title adopted by the institution is University College Scarborough, describing itself as '...an autonomous College of the University of York' (University College Scarborough Prospectus, 1998-99).

Again, this sector, as with the university sector previously, has provided substantial evidence of inconsistency of approach and lack of clarity on the issue of institutional title, compounding the problems of constructing and applying clear, agreed and universally applicable criteria to define and describe the nature of the university college sector.

5.4.3 Further Education Colleges

In 1998/99 there are seventy-two further education colleges in receipt of HEFCE funding for their higher education programmes (Appendix 1: Table 4). Similar search techniques were applied to these institutions, though requiring some adaptation to take account of for example, the absence of a central admissions process such as UCAS providing institutional information, or in some cases where Web-sites did not exist (therefore placing greater emphasis on institutionally-generated material such as prospectuses).

The range of descriptions (rather than, in most instances, institutional titles) which these institutions utilise to detail their relationships with various universities further compounds the problems of precisely delineating the university college sector.

Of these seventy-two institutions, twenty-one [Appendix 1: Table 4(a)] do not make reference to independent (as distinct from franchised) undergraduate provision and any

form of association with a university, still less refer to university college status. In these cases the validation of the work undertaken is provided by a series of sector awarding bodies such as EdExcel, RSA, or City and Guilds. These may therefore be excluded from this analysis.

Of the remaining fifty-one institutions [Appendix 1: Table 4(b)], three are, in the strict sense (that is having a formal agreement with a parent university to use the actual title), university colleges: University College Warrington; University College, Suffolk; and Stockport College of Further and Higher Education. In the last case, although designated as a University College of the University of Manchester, the College, in fact, makes reference to this in a 'strap-line' rather than in the title of the institution.

There are, then, forty-eight institutions which, although not directly utilising the University College title, identify in prospectus material or through electronic media a specific relationship with a single university, or in some instances, multiple partnerships of different types with several university institutions. The range of terms used to describe these relationships is varied and imprecise and requires some explanation in order to illustrate the complexities surrounding inter-institutional collaborative arrangements which is a central element in the issue of title and status since such arrangements are, logically, the basis of the criteria applying to the use of University College title .

Of these forty-eight, five institutions (30) describe themselves as either affiliated to, in partnership with, or as having 'links' with one or more parent universities. A further ten

institutions (31) are described as Associate Colleges of a particular University, or in one case, more than one university.   Of the remaining thirty three institutions, thirty-one refer to a range of *validation* arrangements with the university sector although there are many variants in evidence.   At the level of least engagement, one institution. (32)   Two institutions (33) each have a single degree programme validated by a single university institution.   Ten institutions (34) make reference to validation arrangements involving a number of programmes with a single university partner (in one case not geographically proximate).   Two institutions (35) are engaged in the joint provision with a partner institution (36) of a particular award which is validated by a third (university) institution. The final sixteen institutions (37) are involved in multiple validation agreements with a number of universities for a range of programmes. The two remaining institutions (38) have programmes validated by one degree awarding body but are also described as an Associate College or 'a linked institution' of Bath Spa University College.

Consistent with the analysis of the university sector institutions and the higher education colleges considered previously, the extreme positions, dependent on definitions and criteria, again produce a significantly different map. From the further education sector, of those seventy-two institutions in direct receipt of HEFCE funding for their higher education work, creating a map of the university college sector which is restricted to only those further education institutions which utilise the title would allow the inclusion of two institutions: Warrington Collegiate Institute and University College Suffolk.   This would immediately exclude a third, Stockport College of Further and Higher Education, which has a formal written agreement with the University of Manchester designating the

institution as a University College. Adopting the other extreme position in which all institutions which have a formal association with a parent university, whether based on association, validation, accreditation or affiliation would extend the map to include up to a further twenty-eight institutions.

The significance of the politics of institutional status is most clearly demonstrated by the fact that the three institutions in the further education sector which have adopted the university college title: University College Warrington; Stockport College of Further and Higher Education; and University College Suffolk, and whose use of the title has generated the harshest criticism from the non-university higher education corporations (Santanelli, 1999), have not assumed the title by stealth or subterfuge, but, in fact, in each instance, have formal written approval to use the title under the Charter powers of their 'parent' universities.

5.5 Summary and Conclusions

This chapter set out to construct a single 'map' of the University College sector. The analysis has demonstrated that it is possible only to construct a series of (often mutually contradictory) maps of the higher education providers, each with different characteristics, defining features and frequently ambiguous inter-institutional relationships. The difficulties in establishing a single, clear view of the University Colleges reflects the multiple, contested criteria by which they are defined and which are, in themselves, laden with preconceptions of power and status such as that deriving from taught degree-awarding powers, or from having a title which is directly associated with the university sector. The

preceding analysis of three major groups of higher education providers: the universities; the higher education colleges; and the further education colleges demonstrates that, beyond the difficulties of terminology, the creation of a 'map' of the university colleges, or even the compilation of groupings of institutions which may claim to form part of the sector, is significantly dependent upon the arbitrary establishment of defining characteristics which pre-suppose a set of agreed criteria which, in themselves, depend upon the view of the relevant educational, legal and, importantly, political priorities which determine the structure of higher education. However the map is constructed, exceptions are identifiable.

These issues are most effectively explored by means of a case study of one further education corporation, Warrington Collegiate Institute, which has a formal written agreement under the Royal Charter of a pre-1992 university signifying approval of the use of the university college title for its higher education work and whose continued use of the title was threatened by the recommendations of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 relating to institutional title.

Notes

1. The concept of diversity represented an important theme during the consultation process of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education . The submission of the Standing Conference of Principals (November, 1996) was entitled 'Quality and Diversity' and the concept dominated the submissions of particular institutions, for example Liverpool Hope University College (Lee, 1996). Indeed, its significance was reflected in the final Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education which commented that:

    'We have inherited institutions of very different sizes, with different strengths, different patterns of participation, different offerings by level and subject of study, different local,

regional and national organisations, different legal status and governance arrangements and different histories. Some are of very recent origin: some are ancient foundations; most owe no allegiance to any particular group in society; others are church foundations. All these factors influence the pattern of institutional provision and the institutions' individual and collective characters and strategic aspirations.

Such diversity has considerable strengths, especially in providing for student choice; in programmes and pedagogic innovation; in the ability of institutions to capture the energy and commitment of staff; and in the ability of the sector as a whole to meet the wide range of expectations now relevant to higher education. Indeed, institutional diversity has been one of the important defining characteristics of the United Kingdom's higher education system and, with its concomitant flexibility and autonomy of mission afforded to institutions, is one of the features which distinguishes the UK from some of its international competitors.'

(Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, 1997. Paras. 16.5 and 16: 249).

2. The politically contentious issue of student tuition fees dominated the passing of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998. In fact, the statement of the Secretary of State for Education and Employment to the House of Commons on 23 July 1997 (the day of the publication of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education) was exclusively concerned with the tuition fees issue and student finances. In the draft Parliamentary Bill, no reference was made to the issue of institutional title and it was believed that the matter of university college title would be considered separately by the Government, perhaps through another mechanism. The conspiracy theorists believed that the 'eleventh-hour' inclusion of this issue in the Bill was an attempt by the DfEE to resolve the problem of institutional title, disguised by the focus of attention on student tuition fees in the legislation. This view was expressed in informal conversation with senior colleagues both within and beyond the institution.

3. Professor David Robertson has criticised the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education as lacking the vision which it claimed in its title but has described its contents as a comprehensive account of the current state of the British higher education system (Robertson, 1998).

4. A position which was explicitly criticised in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education (1997. Para. 16.15: 253)

5. The prospect of losing the university college title compelled a number of institutions, notably, Liverpool Hope University College, to make application for degree-awarding powers in order to meet the requirements of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 for the retention of the university college title. In some instances this decision was contrary to previously expressed institutional policy. In an article entitled 'Blunkett Title Ruling Baffles Principals' Tony Grayson, Administrative Secretary at Liverpool Hope University College, confirmed the dilemma which this represented (Tysome, T. *Times Higher*, 19 February, 1999).

6. The Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education *Higher Education in the Learning Society* (London, HMSO. July 1997: 248-262).

7. Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 1. *Education, England and Wales. Education, Scotland.* The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997. This Statutory Instrument was made on 13 January 1997, coming into force on 5 February 1997 (DfEE, HMSO. January 1997).

8. Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54. *Education, England and Wales. Education, Scotland.* The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997. This Statutory Instrument was made on 13 January 1997, coming into force on 5 February 1997 (DfEE, HMSO. January 1997).

9. The Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education made specific reference to the lack of experience of the Committee in this respect, admitting that:

> 'We do not feel competent to address the question of then powers of some pre-1992 university charters, although we consider it inappropriate that they should use those powers in relation to further education colleges which remain separate corporate bodies. We also have reservations about the use of the powers by a chartered university in respect of colleges of higher education where these do not have degree awarding powers and where they remain separate corporate bodies'

> (The Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education *Higher Education in the Learning Society* (London, HMSO. July 1997. Para. 16.31: 256-257).

10. Whilst having the status of university colleges, as further education corporations, neither Stockport College of Further and Higher Education nor University College Suffolk hold membership of the Standing Conference of Principals. Warrington Collegiate Institute holds Associate Membership, a category which is designed to incorporate institutions whose status is in some way different from the higher education institutions which form the main membership and which includes two other institutions, Croydon College and the Anglo-European College of Chiropractic.

11. For example, the publication of the Quality Audit Report of Liverpool Hope University College was delayed by more than one year as a result of the acrimonious dispute between the Rector and Chief Executive of the College and the (then) Chief Executive of the Higher Education Quality Council and his colleague, the Director of the Audit Division. The institution was insisting that the Report be published under the new title which it had assumed in September 1995, several months after the audit visit, and the HEQC was equally adamant in its adherence to the policy that the titles employed in published reports would be only those approved by the Privy Council.

12. Without detailed prior knowledge of the university college sector, the examination of the HEFCE Recurrent Funding Lists for 1998/99 would not necessarily recognise University College, Warrington which appears as Warrington Collegiate Institute; University College, Suffolk which is listed as Suffolk College; and particularly University College Scarborough which is shown as North Riding College.

13. Chichester Institute of Higher Education was, until January 1999, such an example.

14. Franchise arrangements are specifically excluded from this study by the requirement that institutions must be in direct receipt of HEFCE funding for their higher education work.

15. See M. Rhodes (1996*) An Examination of Aspects of Franchising of Higher Education Provision in Further Education Colleges.* Independent Supervised Study. Phase II of the Doctorate in Education programme. November. University of Durham: unpublished.

16. A substantial majority of those higher education institutions employing the University College title do not have formal written agreements with their parent universities approving its use. This is entirely consistent with the absence of a model of institutional collaboration as it relates to validation or accreditation arrangements referred to in *Guidelines on Quality Assurance* (Higher Education Quality Council, 1996. London, HEQC). However, in some instances, universities have given informal approval for validated or accredited institutions to use the title University College for marketing and promotion purposes, often responding to the pressures of competition and the need to retain market position.

17. This was often presented in the national press in the following format with significant difference in print size to emphasise certain elements of the title:

'X Institution'
A
University
Sector
College

18. A variation on the franchising theme, this arrangement is in greater evidence across the higher education sector as (particularly post-1992) universities respond to the pressures of recruitment targets. One example is the relationship which Staffordshire University has developed with numerous further education colleges, including Solihull and Stoke-on-Trent College of Further and Higher Education.

19. It is important to note that the designations which institutions have adopted have changed over time. A number of institutions which began by referring to themselves in a 'strap-line' for marketing or advertising purposes as 'a college in the university sector' (or an equivalent reference) assumed the full designation University College at a later date when it appeared that the precedent had been set. Examples of this include Edge Hill College; St. Martin's College; and King Alfred's Winchester.

20. *Recurrent Funding Lists 1998/99* (Higher Education Funding Council for England. Bristol, 1998. March 98/09 Report).

21. The use of these listings reaffirms the principle of self-designation in this part of the study since both SCOP and UCAS references to institutional title are accepted for publication *as presented* by the institutions concerned and have not felt constrained by the same policy imperatives as, for example, the Higher Education Funding Council for England or the Higher Education Quality Council and latterly, the Quality Assurance Agency.

22. In fact, although University College, Stockton as an integral part of the University of Durham would have been eligible to retain the University College title after 1 February 1999 (refer to footnote 26 below), it was decided in 1998 to adopt the designation University of Durham, Stockton Campus.

23. This condition of approval was made clear when the author, as Director of Quality and Strategic Development, following the successful HEQC Audit Report (which was regarded as a prerequisite to application for taught degree-awarding powers), was discussing the nature of the applications process with officers of HEQC in 1996. In fact this constitutes the essence of the dilemma referred to (in Endnote 5) above in which an institution cannot attain degree awarding powers *and* thereafter remain in the orbit of a parent university.

The University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST) appears to been an exception. In March 1999, the Senate of the University of Manchester approved a request by UMIST to initiate the awarding of its own degrees with immediate effect (University of Manchester Senate, March 16, 1999). Degree awarding powers had been bestowed upon UMIST in 1994 but for a range of historical, political and marketing reasons had not been used.

24. Examples of this are Falmouth College of Arts and Norwich School of Art and Design.

25. The joint course operates in collaboration with the Department of Music at the University of Manchester in which students follow the Mus.B. degree course at the University concurrently with the practical requirements of the non-honours course at the College. Success in both elements leads to the award of the University degree and the Graduateship of the Royal Northern College of Music.

26. 1 February, 1999 was the date of implementation of the Commencement Order relating to Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 prohibiting the use of university college title except under clearly prescribed circumstances.

27. These proposals are set out by the Principal, Dr. Stephen Holt, on the Roehampton Institute website.

28. The Royal College of Nursing Institute was represented at the meeting of the Joint Committee of University Colleges convened by the University of Manchester on 6 January, 1999. This meeting was arranged to explore the various courses of action which the institutions (including the University of Manchester) were proposing in the light of the legislative requirements to cease to use the university college title from 1 February. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss with university college institutions of the University their plans and alternative, acceptable designations. In the event, neither Stockport College of Further and Higher Education nor the Royal College of Nursing Institute was significantly affected since neither employed the university college in their title.

29. It is interesting to note that policy declaration is not always borne out in implementation. The HEFCE Recurrent Funding Lists 1998/99 (Higher Education Funding Council for England. 98/09, March Report. Bristol, 1998) refer to Liverpool Hope College, the official trading name of the company, whilst the Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54. *Education, England and Wales. Education, Scotland.* The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997, refers to Liverpool Institute of Higher Education, its previous and official, Privy Council approved designation.

30. One institution, Askham Bryan College, is described as *affiliated* to the University of Leeds. One College, Mid Kent, refers to being in *partnership* with the University of Kent. One institution, Walsall College of Arts and Technology, refers to *partnership* with numerous universities including the University of Central England, Coventry University, Leeds Metropolitan University, Staffordshire University, and Wolverhampton University. One institution, Birmingham College, makes reference to being an accredited college of the University of Birmingham, a description which, as we have seen, also applies to Newman and Westhill Colleges of Higher Education. One institution, the College of North-West London, is described as having 'links' with Middlesex University, Westminster University and Thames Valley University.

31. These institutions are: Blackpool and the Fylde College (University of Lancaster); Carlisle College (University of Northumbria at Newcastle); Chesterfield College (Sheffield Hallam University); City of Liverpool Community College (Liverpool John Moores University); Farnborough College of Technology (University of Surrey); Hammermith and West London College (University of Westminster); Reading College and School of Art and Design (Oxford Brookes University); Solihull College (University of Warwick and Coventry University) and which is also a member of the Further and Higher Education partnership with the University of Sheffield and also refers to flourishing partnerships with the Universities of Leicester, Manchester, Staffordshire and Wolverhampton; St. Helens College (Liverpool John Moores University); and York College of Further and Higher Education (University of York).

32. Cleveland College of Art and Design identifies a single programme whose assessment is validated by the University of Teesside.

33. These institutions are: Brooklands College (University of Greenwich); and Sparsholt College (University of Portsmouth)

34. These institutions are: Bradford and Ilkley (University of Bradford); Coventry Technical College (University of Warwick); Dewsbury College (University of Huddersfield); Doncaster College (Sheffield Hallam University); Henley College, Coventry (Coventry University); Leeds College of Art and Design (University of Leeds); Northbrook College, Sussex (Open University); Peterborough Regional College (University of Sheffield); The Sheffield College (Sheffield Hallam University); and Wirral Metropolitan College (Staffordshire University).

35. Herefordshire College of Technology and Herefordshire College of Art and Design jointly provide an undergraduate programme which is validated by the University of Wales; and Crawley College (a further education corporation) offers an undergraduate programme jointly with Chichester Institute of Higher Education (a university college) which is validated by the University of Southampton.

36. Chichester Institute of Higher Education was granted degree-awarding powers in February 1999 and in accordance with the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 is therefore eligible to use the university college designation.

37. Blackburn College (University of Huddersfield, University of Glamorgan, University of Hull, University of Lancaster, and the University of Central Lancashire); Bournemouth and Poole College of Art and Design (Surrey Institute of Art and Design and Bournemouth University); Cordwainers College (City University and the Royal College of Art); Croydon College (the prospectus refers to Sussex University and 'others'); Guildford College of Further and Higher Education and Halton College (both of which refer to links with an unspecified 'number of universities'); Herefordshire College of Art and Design (University of Wales and University of Central England); New College Durham (University of Sunderland and the Open University); North-East Surrey College of Technology (University of London, University of Surrey and the Open University); Salisbury College (University of Bath and Southampton Institute); Southport College (Liverpool John Moores and University of Central Lancashire); Swindon College University of Leicester, University of Sunderland and Cranfield University); Wakefield College (Leeds Metropolitan University and Sheffield Hallam University);Westminster College (Nottingham Trent University and University of Westminster); West Thames College (Kingston University, Royal Holloway [University of London], and University of North London); and Wigan and Leigh College (University of Huddersfield, University of Wolverhampton; University of Lincolnshire and Humberside; University of Central Lancashire, and Manchester University).

38. Lackham College and Trowbridge College have programmes validated by one degree awarding body (Lackham, by the Royal Agricultural College at Cirencester and Trowbridge by the University of the West of England) but are also described as an Associate College or 'a linked institution' of Bath Spa University College.

CHAPTER 6

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE WARRINGTON – A CASE STUDY

6.1 The Institutional Context

In October 1993 an Agreement was signed by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Manchester and the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Warrington Collegiate Institute under Article XX of the Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations of the University, designating Warrington Collegiate Institute as a University College of the University of Manchester, following more than three decades in which the relationship between the two institutions had become progressively closer. From that point University College Warrington became the formal title attaching to the higher education work of the Institute. In response to the concerns expressed by the last Secretary of State for Education and Employment in the Conservative administration of the 1990s, the Committee of Inquiry led by Sir Ron Dearing was requested to report on the issue of institutional title. The recommendations of the Report (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, 1997) questioned the right of pre-1992 Universities to use their Charter powers to bestow the title University College and established a restrictive set of criteria relating to institutional title which threatened its continued use by Warrington Collegiate Institute. In June 1998, when the implications of the Teaching and Higher Education Bill became apparent, the Institute launched a concerted campaign to retain the title. In January 1999, the Principal of Warrington Collegiate Institute received a letter from the DfEE (1) confirming that the Institute was to be permitted to continue to use the University College title for its higher education work beyond the implementation of the Commencement Order

on 1 February 1999 which enacted that part of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 relating to institutional titles and names. This 'stay of execution', albeit temporary, in respect of a single institution, (2) represented a *'...remarkable outcome...'* (3) to a campaign which had dominated the affairs of the higher education managers within the Institute for many months and, in the context of the debate in the sector relating to institutional title, offers a revealing and important case study which highlights the extent to which political and status considerations dominated the debate regarding the legitimate use of the title 'University College'.

In view of the complexities of sector definition and the impreciseness with which boundaries have been drawn to delineate inclusive (or exclusive) groupings of institutions set out in Chapter 5, the significance of the case study of a single institution in the midst of this diversity, as an instrument to explore aspects of the university college title debate, requires brief explanation.

It will be readily apparent that Warrington Collegiate Institute is atypical even of the heterogeneous group of institutions discussed in the previous chapter. The historical development of the organisation, its responses to the recent policy initiatives and legislation which threaten its continued use of the title University College, and indeed its future academic profile, do not typify the sector. In that sense, this case study is not offered as a representation of institutions within the sector.

Similarly, to offer a chronological account (as a participant observer or as an historian) of the responses of the institution to the various policy developments would not provide the necessary level of comparative analysis to enable sector-wide conclusions to be reached since such detailed information has not been gathered for other, similarly placed, institutions in the sector. It is important, then, to provide a justification for the use of a case study of Warrington Collegiate Institute in the context of this research.

6.2   The Case Study Approach

The case study approach reflects, in a way that is not possible from the historical or sector perspectives, the detailed organisational reactions and responses to the perceived threat of the loss of University College title and provides a institutional focus for the factors relating to title and status considered elsewhere in this study. As a unique instance of the general issues raised as they relate to institutional title and status, the case study analysis offers the clearest example of the impact of policy conflict in which, as an organisation, Warrington Collegiate Institute is committed to lifelong learning and the widening of access precisely in accordance with current Government policy. The institution has a vibrant community base, provides a continuum of educational opportunity from adult and basic education to postgraduate level, (thereby fulfilling many of the main objectives of recent government policy) and yet its continued use of the University College title has been threatened by the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998. This institutional case study therefore encapsulates the tensions and issues explored throughout this study.

The resolution of policy conflict itself provides an important, more general, justification for the use of the case study as a tool of investigation in this context. The analysis of policy in practice is made more meaningful when its implications are explored in detail at the level of the institution rather than (exclusively) at governmental or sector level since it demonstrates how the detailed impact of the conflict of policy initiatives generates tensions and issues which are addressed within the institution. In policy scholarship terms, the examination of institutional responses to policy conflict provides an important insight into the complexity at institutional level which the processes of policy formulation at national level often disregard. The ethnographic aspect of the case study thus provides an active account of policy in practice. Importantly, from the viewpoint of this research, the case study also affords the opportunity to examine, by reference to the historical analysis undertaken in the early part of the study, the manner in which similar tensions and issues existed within previous generations of university colleges and the extent to which different political and social contexts produced markedly different outcomes.

The value of the case study in this context is to reinforce the complexities of the university college sector (if indeed it may be so designated) and the highly individualistic institutions which it comprises. This case study is constructed to focus upon a series of issues rather than to provide a chronology, and provides an insight into the significance of the University College title for one institution, in the knowledge that, in view of the nature of the sector examined in the previous chapter, different but equally complex implications have been identified and considered in other institutions currently bearing the title, provoking different reactions, strategies and tactical responses. The case study therefore

provides an opportunity to identify issues (often exclusively) affecting Warrington Collegiate Institute which would not necessarily emerge from a sector-level analysis and, conversely, the framework of issues raises the level of analysis from the merely idiosyncratic and case-bound to enable at least an outline sector analysis to be undertaken. In this sense, the case study transcends the principle of representative selection. While the study of a unique case does not always purport to assert the instance-class relation (Bell *et. al.*, 1984), this approach reveals important complexities and subtleties which are generalisable from case to case.

The case study provides a clear and sharply focused example of the critical issues of institutional title and status, encapsulating the debate relating to institutional and sector reform which has been set out in the preceding chapters, and suggests that the recommendations of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 failed to recognise the complexities of institutional mission, purpose and structure represented by the term University College. The recommendations, it will be argued, were applied differentially (and exclusively) on the basis of corporate status, in which those further education corporations referred to as University Colleges have been prevented from continuing to use the title and, most importantly, denied the means of fulfilling the criteria established for its legitimate use without radical change to their organisational structure, governance and funding.

The case study employs four main perspectives on the nature and work of University College Warrington and its response to the threat posed by the loss of University College

title: i) its history and development; ii) institutional profile; iii) its external relationships; and iv) the political campaign which was mounted to defend its position. This analysis will demonstrate the clear and direct parallels with many of the institutions considered in Chapter 3, and will highlight the similarities and contrasts of circumstance which influenced decisions relating to changes in institutional status in the pre-Robbins higher education sector, and those affecting an individual institution in the 1990s.

6.3 The History and Development of University College Warrington

6.3.1 Origins

The historical account of the pre-Robbins university colleges provided in Chapter 3 sought to identify a number of consistent themes which, in the context of the unstructured growth and development of these institutions, represented important contributory factors common to their success and their transformation into universities. Among these common themes was a shared history based on comparable processes of institutional development and growth leading to independence, a sense of institutional aspiration based on a clearly expressed community ambition, and a close relationship to the local and regional economy, strengthened by a demand for locally available education and training. The increasing demand for educational opportunity in many instances was inextricably linked to issues of civic pride, (4) social and (individual and organisational) political aspiration. In many instances such ambition was reflected in the public advocacy role of leading local politicians, social reformers and benefactors.

Extending this mode of analysis to the historical development of Warrington Collegiate Institute reveals marked similarities in an institutional, political and social context, but which offer (at least potentially) equally marked contrasts in outcome for institutional status and aspiration.

A dominant concern in the development of the University College sector over many decades has been the level of the academic work undertaken within the institutions and, more recently, the volume of higher education work as a proportion of the whole. (5) Indeed, these factors dominated the early debate on the legitimate use of the university college title. In 1995 the (then) Chairman of the Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP) Dr James Burke who, on behalf of SCOP, led the initial discussions on this issue with Gillian Shephard, the (first) Secretary of State for Education and Employment, in presenting criteria by which colleges might be granted authority to use the University College title, maintained that:

> '....it was more important to specify the percentage of degree work than the size of the institution and the number of students....We have not spelt it out but it would be far more than 55 per cent. Otherwise this would leave the doors open for some further education colleges.'
>
> (Santanelli, P. 'Gillian Shephard Ponders Future Status' The Times Higher Education Supplement. 30.6.95: 12)

Although in the course of the debate a range of alternative criteria have been proposed, often equally divisive, (6) this particular formulation represented an essential barrier to further education corporations (regardless of size, curriculum range, quality or internal

structure) having legitimate claim to the title University College and, given the origins of the institution, has represented a principal source of the sense of injustice (7) which has characterised the campaign conducted by Warrington Collegiate Institute, which was mounted in response to the threat posed by Section 39 of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 to the continued use of the University College title to describe its higher education work. The justification for this stance, although not readily accepted by the DfEE, sector agencies or by many higher education institutions, is clear and is set out below.

The higher education provision within the Institute has significantly different origins from many further education corporations, since it developed from a College of Higher Education established in 1946 dedicated exclusively to initial teacher education. In the radical restructuring and rationalisation of teacher education in the late 1970s, such institutions, for a wide variety of strategic and political reasons, envisaged their futures in a range of different collaborative relationships, with some institutions pursuing an independent existence beyond the reforms and others electing to enter into collaborative arrangements or full merger with universities, and some, of course, ceasing to exist. (8) In the case of Warrington Collegiate Institute, as a result of a conscious, strategically-motivated decision, the higher education provision was merged with the pre-existing Further Education College and the College of Art and Design in the locality, based on a rationale which pre-dated the lifelong learning, vocational training and access agenda which so publicly dominated the New Labour election manifesto in the mid 1990s. This merger it is suggested:

> *'....enhanced both higher and further education provision in the town by creating opportunities for wider access, greater vocational emphasis and responsiveness to the local community'.*

<div align="right">(Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1998: p2).</div>

The awareness of these origins as a higher education college, many of whose contemporaries became an integral part of the university sector, has exacerbated the sense of injustice which the Institute and the Warrington community has expressed in the campaign to retain the University College title and status which was launched in July 1998 as the potential impact of the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act became apparent. The campaign was based essentially upon: (a) the strength of the relationship with the University of Manchester and the existence of a formal, written, agreement as a legitimate exercise of the University's Charter powers bestowing the designation University College; (b) the College's history as a provider of higher education; (c) strong civic and community support; and (d) its current organisational commitment to widening participation and the provision of a continuum of learning opportunities at all levels from basic and adult education to postgraduate education. Essentially, Warrington Collegiate Institute is promoting all the significant aspects of the Labour Government's agenda to promote access and widen participation.

6.3.2 Community Links

The strength of the links with the local community is evident. In the university college sector, pre-Robbins, and particularly in their progression to university status, numerous histories and biographies have shown the significance of civic pride and strong community

involvement in institutional development (Fiddes, 1937; Cottle, 1951; Gallie, 1960; Bettenson, 1971; Holt, 1977; Gosden and Taylor, 1975; Bamford, 1978).

In the campaign to retain the title University College, there has been extensive and consistent support from all elements of the Warrington community, political, business and educational. The political lobbying sought to capitalise on the extent and depth of feeling on the issue. As a rapidly growing new town, the existence of a recognised higher education presence identifiable by its title and directly associated with the Warrington community rapidly became an issue of civic pride.

The Institute also clearly recognised and valued its civic associations. In a commentary which set out the position of the Institute on this issue, the relationship with the community is boldly stated and is worthy of extended quotation:

> 'University College Warrington is regarded as an essential resource in the town, with its commitment to greater accessibility and enhanced participation in higher education, increased flexibility of delivery and comprehensive post-16 education. Our higher education contributes directly and indirectly to the local economy of Warrington. At the hub of the region's communication network, Warrington continues to thrive and attract new business. In addition to its many other attributes, the presence of prestigious higher education provides a clear incentive for prospective inward investors to consider the town in a positive light. It provides for the town its own university level presence...Therefore to retain our credibility with local Warrington students, the University College title is essential in conveying accurately the quality of the provision offered.'

> (Warrington Collegiate Institute: 1998: p2).

6.3.3 *Advocacy*

The historical analysis of the university college sector set out in Chapter 3 demonstrates the extent to which the successful development of university colleges and their progression to university status was also dependent upon the strong advocacy of their case for recognition as universities by one or more influential individuals. In the case of Warrington, in addition to the support provided by current and former members of (both Houses of) Parliament, (9) the Chief Executive of the new unitary local authority (which had been established formally in April 1998), formerly Principal of Warrington Collegiate Institute, together with the Chief Executive of the Chamber of Commerce who is also Chair of Governors of the Institute, have played a leading advocacy role in attempting to secure the title and status of University College Warrington by direct, personal involvement in the political campaign.

In terms of the historical development of the institution, its relationship with the local community and the strength of advocacy in its support, the parallels with both past and current university colleges are clear.

6.4 **Institutional Profile**

6.4.1 *The Academic Curriculum*

While the parallels in institutional histories between University College Warrington and many of the institutions considered in Chapter 3 of this study are demonstrable, in its current structure the institution is also distinctive in a number of significant respects.

The Institute is currently the seventh largest provider of higher education of the seventy-two described as 'mixed economy' further education institutions. (10) The higher education work of the Institute, funded by the Higher Education Funding Council, constitutes approximately twenty-five per cent of its total provision and ranges from certificate and diploma courses to postgraduate taught programmes. Relative to the remainder of the current University College sector, for example some higher education colleges, such as Liverpool Hope University College or Edge Hill University College, its higher education provision is small and the range and level of courses and the curriculum 'mix' of academic/vocational and professional provision is comparatively specialised. University College Warrington has established a focused curriculum which reflects its academic strengths in providing a high-level vocational education and its established reputation. The College has identified its market clearly and has eschewed the opportunities to extend the range of programmes offered in order to assume a 'polytechnic' character. However, reflecting on the curriculum range of the institutions considered in Chapter 3 which developed from university colleges into universities, a specialist curriculum also has direct parallels with many of the university colleges which eventually acquired university status.

6.4.2   Corporate Status

It is as a further education corporation with a collegiate structure, part of which is designated as a University College of the University of Manchester, that the Institute is distinct from the vast majority of institutions which bear the title University College and which are classified as higher education corporations. This structure has traditionally

> *'....enable[d] the Institute to maintain a higher education ethos and culture for the students within a mixed economy college well placed to encourage and develop wider access...(and).... local provision....with clear progression routes to higher education.'*

> (Warrington Collegiate Institute,1996a: 1).

Despite the advantages which this institutional structure affords, its status as a further education corporation has historically generated a range of substantial disadvantages. For example, Warrington Collegiate Institute as a substantial provider of higher education, has been denied access to capital equipment allocations (prior to 1996 when capital funding to higher education institutions ceased). The funding anomalies relating to capital allocations were clearly stated in the Institute's response to the HEFCE Report which commented:

> *'Unfortunately the Report makes no recommendation regarding Capital Funding, which we regard as a serious omission. It seems perverse that HEFCE should be responsible for our recurrent funding, but not the capital. Moreover, this is likely to become an even more serious problem in the future as FEFC introduces a unit-based tariff for Capital Funding which currently seems to be taking no account of HE provision. Our courses in Television and Radio Production, Music.... Sport and Theatre are all very capital intensive and this is therefore an urgent concern....'*

> (Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1996a: 3).

These inequities, based on corporate status, extended further. In 1996 a Higher Education Funding Council publication (HEFCE, 1996b) announced what came to be referred to as the 'FE discount' which maintained that a reduced level of funding for higher education students in further education colleges was defensible on the grounds that the infrastructure costs for these students were provided by the Further Education Funding Council. (11) These proposals were abandoned following an in-depth study of the relative costs of

delivering higher education in the further and higher education sectors which confirmed that such costs were directly comparable, thereby removing one justification for distinguishing between higher education providers by sector. (12)

Equally significantly, in some instances the Institute has been unable to bid directly for special initiative funding to the Higher Education Funding Council for England. The Institute has found this particularly anomalous since many recent HEFCE initiatives have specified increased access and widening participation as core criteria, (13) commitments which are at the centre of the Institute's Mission. As a Further Education Corporation the Institute has also been excluded from membership of (formerly) the Higher Education Quality Council (now the Quality Assurance Agency). This latter exclusion is particularly important in that it was deemed essential in the period 1993-97 to support an application for taught degree awarding powers with a positive institutional quality audit report from HEQC. That Warrington Collegiate Institute, because of its status as a further education corporation, was denied access to membership to this higher education sector body, effectively removed any opportunity that may have existed to fulfil one of the principal criteria, later enshrined in the 1998 Act, to enable the institution to retain the University College title, namely the attainment of taught degree awarding powers. This exclusion was confirmed, though perhaps not satisfactorily explained, in later discussions with officials at the DfEE. (14)

None of these disadvantages applied to the higher education corporations constituting the substantial majority of the university college sector. This is apparently attributable to the corporate status of further education colleges, although discussions with DfEE officials and an analysis of the detail of the case study and the various positions adopted by sector agencies and, in some cases, other institutions suggests that wider status considerations influenced this exclusion. (15)

In order to demonstrate the inequities of these policy decisions, the Institute has been compelled to argue that the Higher Education Funding Council for England should differentiate more clearly between Further Education Corporations since 'mixed economy' colleges vary greatly in the nature and size of their higher education provision and its related HEFCE funding (Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1996a).

Throughout its recent history the Institute has remained faithful to its mission as an organisation based on a Community College model, dedicated to the provision of a continuum of educational opportunity offering progression routes from adult and basic education to postgraduate qualifications, and advocating a strengthening of the relationship between further and higher education (Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1996b). The Institute has shown itself concerned to influence sector planning by promoting local provision of higher education. It has supported through responses to consultation documents the control of 'mission drift' in further education colleges and has expressed its opposition to the cross-subsidy from the FE sector to support under-funded higher education programmes franchised on a fees only basis by University sector institutions

(Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1995: 4). Above all, the Institute has sought to ensure that

> '....the success of the mixed economy colleges is recognised in ensuring
> lifelong learning, flexibility and diversity, student choice, a vocational
> emphasis, guaranteed quality standards, effective communication, a sharing
> of good practice, increased mutual capability, local access to higher
> education to achieve continued economic regeneration, enhanced business
> competitiveness and the fulfilment of individual student potential. '
>
> (Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1995: 5).

In defending its status as a provider of higher education, legitimately utilising the title University College to describe that element of the organisation responsible for its delivery, the Institute has maintained distinctiveness in structure and aspiration, whilst recognising that its status as a further education corporation (notwithstanding the creative presentation of its higher education work within the Collegiate structure) has itself weakened its case for the continued use of the title University College.

This dilemma has crystallised as the various means available to the Institute legitimately to retain the University College title have been explored, and the legal and corporate implications of the 1998 legislation were recognised by its senior managers and legal advisors throughout the campaign to retain the title.

6.4.3 The Student Profile

A dominant feature of the organisational ethos which, the evidence suggests, characterises Warrington Collegiate Institute, is the commitment to the development of wider access, local provision and a range of entry points with clear progression routes to higher education qualifications, which are consistent and widely expressed elements of the

225

Government's agenda. Indeed, in a statement in support of its claim to retain the University College title, this was presented as a strength of the institution, clearly aligning itself to

> *'The Government's commitment to expand student numbers in F/HE by 500,000 and to target resources which genuinely widen participation inevitably and rightly....(meaning).... that more students will be adults, will enter HE from non-traditional routes and will wish to study near their established homes and families....If higher education is to become truly available to those who have been traditionally excluded from its opportunities, it must be locally available and accessible.'*

> (Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1998: 1 - 2).

The view, consistently expressed by senior representatives of Warrington Collegiate Institute, is that 'mixed economy' colleges have an important role to play in the future of higher education provision at a local level. It is maintained that

> *'....higher education represents a resource which should be delivered locally. It is being increasingly exploited at the local level by both individuals and employers....to provide specialist support, training, education and research facilities. Therefore the 'distribution' of higher education access points is important and certainly communities with a minimum of 200,000 population should provide a critical mass to underpin and support an HE access point.'*
> (Warrington Collegiate Institute,1995: 3).

A secondary factor in the fulfilment of the institutional mission is the establishment and promotion of clear progression routes into higher education. Whilst it is beyond the scope of this thesis to research the higher education destinations generally of those students within Warrington Collegiate Institute on sub-degree level courses, there are several acclaimed and well-publicised examples of students entering the Institute to study on an Access to Higher Education programme and progressing to complete a Masters level qualification (Parliamentary Brief. May 1998: 34).

The structure of the Institute, comprising separate but integrated sections, including the work of a college orientated to higher education, two colleges largely focusing on further education, and a significant section dedicated to lifelong learning within one institutional framework, provides a continuum of education and training opportunities central to the organisational mission and offers a synergy which has seen the Institute's

> '.... further education grow by 40% in the last five years to over 3500 full-time equivalent students with...higher education providing full time degree and diploma courses to over 1000 full time equivalent students. Hence there has been no mission drift'
>
> (Letter from the Principal and Chief Executive Warrington Collegiate Institute to Helen Jones, MP. 3 July 1998).

This re-emphasises the point that the further education and higher education work within the Institute are in a symbiotic relationship, providing a curriculum synergy through the co-existence within a single institution of courses at adult basic, further and higher education levels.

The issue of student profile is equally relevant, of course, to the range of University Colleges in the sector, many of which seek to meet the needs of a particular client group and maintain distinctive mission statements to reflect specific objectives ranging from vocational to particular denominational or ecumenical education and training. It is an issue for further research to assess whether such institutional missions are reflected in their respective student profiles.

6.5 External Relationships

6.5.1 The University of Manchester

The nature of the relationship of Warrington Collegiate Institute, and in particular University College Warrington, with the University of Manchester has been regarded by many of those directly involved in the issue in both institutions as a (perhaps *the*) crucial factor in legitimising the continued claim which is made to the university college title and the status which it conveys. The documentary evidence available, confirmed in statements by senior representatives of both institutions, indicates that this is a shared perception. Throughout the debate on this issue the University of Manchester has remained supportive of the case made by Warrington Collegiate Institute, but unable to affect the policy decision on institutional title and name.

In structural terms, the relationship between Warrington Collegiate Institute and the University of Manchester has been distinguished from that which exists with a larger number of institutions which are affiliated to the University. In a draft paper submitted to a meeting of the Joint Committee on University Colleges, the relationship of a university college to the University of Manchester was described as

> '....more organic and symbiotic than that of an Affiliated Institution. A University College has direct access to the University Senate and as such University Colleges have a neo-[sic] Faculty relationship with the University. '
>
> (University of Manchester 1996: 1).

This is clearly a distinguishing feature of the status which the University of Manchester has conferred upon three of its affiliated institutions: Warrington Collegiate Institute; the Royal

228

College of Nursing Institute; and Stockport College of Further and Higher Education. The granting of University College status (16) is dependent on the University being satisfied that the institution concerned

> '....has sufficient academic maturity and that the academic standards of its
> provision and calibre of teaching staff are appropriate'.

<div align="right">(University of Manchester, 1996: 1).</div>

The structural relationship between the two institutions is embodied in a formal written declaration which designates Warrington Collegiate Institute as a University College of the University of Manchester and which makes specific reference to the appropriate Ordinance, Regulation and Statute (University of Manchester, 1998) authorising the status and title under the powers of the Royal Charter originally granted in April 1880. The Supplemental Charter granted by Letters Patent to the Victoria University of Manchester on February 12, 1973 which revoked the provisions of the Charters of 1880, 1883, 1898 and 1903 (except in so far as they related to the incorporation of The Victoria University of Manchester) specifically decrees the following powers:

> 'To admit to affiliation with the University or to any of its privileges or to
> recognise for any purpose and either in whole or in part any institution or
> body or persons connected therewith and from time to time to terminate or
> modify the terms and conditions of any such affiliation or recognition.'
> (University of Manchester,
> 1973. Section IV [j]: 28).

The distinction between university college status and affiliation, and, indeed other forms of institutional association is a crucial and confusing issue in the debate relating to the legitimate use of the University College title, and represents an important element of the analysis in the preceding chapter. Whilst the right of the Council of the University of

Manchester to admit institutions to affiliation is enshrined in Ordinance and Statute, the point at issue is whether the resolution that

> *'Council has after report from Senate admitted the following to affiliation as a University College: Warrington Collegiate Institute.'*
> (University of Manchester, 1993. Regulation XV)

was a legitimate exercise of its prerogative. Although the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education acknowledged its lack of competence to address such matters as the appropriate exercise of pre-1992 University Charter powers (Dearing, 1997: Para. 16.31: 256-257) this issue was fundamental to the recommendations of the Committee.

Formally, the relationship between the two institutions is widely documented and is reflected in the representation which University College has on the University Senate and a range of major University committees (17) commensurate with its status, which is deemed to be equivalent to a Faculty of the University. The agreement requires University College to seek final approval for the appointment of external examiners to its courses, to invite a University representative on appointments panels for new members of staff, and to be subject to the University 'recognition' of its staff - matters which resonate closely with the conditions of collaboration described in Chapter 3 of this study established by the University of London with a range of university colleges in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In some respects, notably in the exercise of independent judgement relating to the admission and examination of students, the current relationship between Warrington Collegiate Institute and the University of Manchester places a greater level of responsibility (and obligation) on University College, Warrington in the maintenance of

quality and standards than that of many of the university colleges prior to the 1960s, whose right to use the title University College was unquestioned (perhaps unquestionable).

Across the sector, the model of collaboration between universities and university colleges which has evolved into federation by virtue of the institutional ambition and aspiration of university colleges and their university partners, has been embodied in legislation and defined as 'federal' in such a way, it may be argued, as to protect and preserve the interests of, for example the University of London (as the earliest federal institution). The model has served simultaneously to prevent other institutions in the late twentieth century (with greater justification in terms of their level and range of independent responsibilities to a range of external agencies) from following the same developmental path as their nineteenth century counterparts. This may be the basis of the view of at least one College Principal, who regarded the recommendations and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 in respect of title and name, as representing restrictive practice, maintaining that:

> *'The fact is there is no legal bar on us using the title....and even if the government tried to apply one through domestic legislation, European law would rule out such action.'*
>
> (Lee, 1997: 5).

The relationship between Warrington Collegiate Institute and the University of Manchester throughout this period of uncertainty, essentially 1994-97, has remained mutually supportive. The tenor of the discussions and documentary exchanges between the two institutions has been characterised by a sense of urgency and priority on the part of Warrington Collegiate Institute (reflecting the significance of the issue to its strategic

future) in pursuit of a solution which would both meet the criteria established by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and enable the continued use of the university college designation. Senior staff of the University of Manchester have expressed unequivocal support for Warrington Collegiate Institute in its campaign to retain the title. (18)

The strength of feeling and the vigorous support in defence of institutional title and status has direct parallels in the history of many University Colleges throughout the last one hundred and thirty years, institutions which have subsequently, and often relatively recently, developed into highly regarded universities on which the reputation of British higher education has been founded.

6.5.2 Relationships with Sector Agencies

The relationship with the University of Manchester has clearly been of central significance in the development of higher education in University College Warrington. However, as an independent further education corporation and an institution whose higher education provision is funded separately by the Higher Education Funding Council for England, Warrington Collegiate Institute has an extensive range of (direct and indirect) contacts with, and accountabilities and obligations to, a large number of external agencies, for example the DfEE, the further and higher education funding councils, a range of quality assurance inspectorates, and numerous representative bodies such as the Standing Conference of Principals.

These relationships, particularly during the period 1994-97, have provided a revealing dimension to the issue of institutional title characterised by uncertainty and ambiguity, particularly with regard to the status of the institution and the clear definition of the sector to which it belongs.

The protection of the position of the University of London and the University of Wales has significantly influenced the logic which determined the structure and form of the 1998 legislation as it relates to titles and status. Although the views of CVCP were clearly influential, it is important to recognise that the University Colleges are affiliated exclusively to pre-1992 universities. There were clear internal divisions within the CVCP on this issue with the greatest evidence of the 'drawbridge mentality' to be found in the attitude of the post-1992 universities, a sector whose status and titles had changed most recently and whose new status and, equally importantly, student market was threatened by the formal recognition and growth of the University Colleges as a legitimised sector. (19)

The position of the Standing Conference of Principals (SCOP), as a sector agency supposedly representing the interests of its members on this issue, found the associate membership of Warrington Collegiate Institute (as distinct from the full member status which the organisation historically had enjoyed as a higher education institution) progressively more difficult to reconcile with its public stance on the University College title issue. The SCOP stance on this issue conflicted with the position which would have preserved the University College title and status for Warrington Collegiate Institute (the

only further education corporation in this position which was also an associate member of SCOP).

The Standing Conference of Principals, in seeking to increase its influence by extending its representative base, had authorised membership for a number of 'mixed economy' F/HE institutions' in the 1990s. However, this had complicated its stance on the issue of institutional designation and the criteria which it proposed should define those institutions which could legitimately claim the title University College, a factor which is emphasised in the difficulties associated with sectoral mapping in Chapter 5. SCOP, in seeking to ensure that the SCOP and CVCP positions were as far as possible aligned, was perpetually conscious of the opposition of some members of the CVCP to the actions of some pre-1992 universities in using charter powers to enable associate colleges to claim with some legitimacy the right to the designation university college. [20] This opposition may have been attributable to a concern relating to the threat to the post-1992 universities' market which the university college sector represented, drawing applicants on the basis of a reputational status which derived, in part at least from the pre-1992 universities with which they were associated, an advantage that was denied to the post-1992 universities which, in the majority of cases, had not established a comparable reputation for the quality of their provision or the status of their awards.

In a letter to Baroness Blackstone, the SCOP Chairman, Dr. Martin Gaskell, strongly supported Recommendation 65 of the report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education relating to University College title, maintaining that

'....(SCOP) has been pressing for many years for the resolution of this problem and for the application of a clear and robust but unambiguous criterion which would curtail the improper misuse [sic] and abuse of the title by some Colleges. However, as I have consistently said to ministers of the previous administration and to DfEE officers during my time as Chairman of SCOP, I am very concerned about the delay in establishing a precise and legally enforceable criterion. For the longer uncertainty persists, the more institutions will take onto themselves the title university college in an arbitrary (and in my view illegal) way, and so devalue further the terminology.'

(Letter from Dr. M. Gaskell to the Minister of State for Higher Education, 4 August, 1997).

The collective SCOP view did not, perhaps could not, reflect the position of each individual member institution. Indeed, the acceptance of the SCOP position and the adoption of the criteria which SCOP had recommended for the use of the title University College would have precluded Warrington Collegiate Institute from continuing to use the title as a further education corporation with a minority of its work in higher education.

The relationship with external quality agencies in higher education is simply described. Warrington Collegiate Institute by virtue of its status as a further education corporation was permanently excluded from membership of the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) until the demise of HEQC in 1997. Its successor organisation, established in April 1997, the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education has assumed responsibility for the (formerly separate processes of institutional audit and subject review) new unified quality assurance structure within higher education which is applied to all programmes funded by the HEFCE. The institution, therefore, until 1997, was structurally excluded from the group of institutions eligible to apply for degree-awarding powers, since a successful institutional audit report from the Higher Education Quality Council was

considered a prerequisite to a formal application. The institution was thereby historically prevented from fulfilling one of the criteria, later established by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and incorporated into the subsequent legislation, necessary to retain the University College title, namely the attainment of taught degree-awarding powers

Beyond these mainstream sector organisations, the analysis of the relationship between Warrington Collegiate Institute and a range of other agencies, the written exchanges and the various responses to initiatives and consultation documents from various sources, demonstrates the extent to which the status of Warrington Collegiate Institute, its ethos, mission, organisational structure and sources of funding have presented a continuing difficulty for numerous bodies across and beyond the higher education sector. These problems have ranged from the important and serious status differentiations emanating from the lack of clear sector representation to relatively minor, but nonetheless revealing, instances, demonstrating the extent of the difficulties experienced by the Institute in defence of its position in the light of the doubt and questioning from a wide range of (often unexpected) sources. (21)

6.6   The Political Campaign

A widespread feature of the pre-Robbins University Colleges was the vigour with which they conducted political campaigns in their attempts to attain full university status. In similar vein, when it became clear in June 1998 that the draft legislation nearing Parliamentary approval, in fact, contained specific reference to the University College title

issue, Warrington Collegiate Institute responded forcefully to those Sections (particularly 39 and 40) of the Bill relating to institutional title. This response took several forms.

First, entirely consistently with the profile of the Institute as a community-based organisation, the support of a range of business, community and education leaders was sought formally by the Principal and Chief Executive, consciously linking the anomaly of the potential loss of the University College title with the attainment of unitary status for Warrington Borough Council. The significance of the community involvement in this issue and the damage to civic pride which the loss of the title threatened was made explicit thus:

> *'It would be particularly ironic if the removal of the University College title were to take place at a time when the town of Warrington has just been granted unitary status – a recognition of the sense of community and civic pride which can be engendered in a community of this size. The current threat to remove its 'University College' can only be seen by residents as a regressive step'*

> (Letter form the Principal and Chief Executive of Warrington Collegiate Institute to Rt. Hon. David Blunkett MP Secretary of State for Education and Employment, 5 June, 1998).

The close involvement of community leaders and a wide range of notable figures in politics, business and education in the Warrington locality was evident in the lobbying of the Minister of State and the local MPs on the Institute's behalf.

A substantial campaign, based on the importance of a recognised and appropriately designated higher education presence in the community, attracted extensive support from

both influential private citizens and public officials including headteachers, local councillors, senior representatives of private commercial interests, a range of public agencies, and major local employers. (22)

Having already approached the Principals of numerous University Colleges in the sector in March 1998, (23) the campaign extended to the direct involvement of the two local MPs, Helen Jones (Warrington North) and Helen Southworth (Warrington South), Mike Hall a former student of the Institute and currently MP for Weaver Vale, a neighbouring constituency, Brian Simpson (MEP for Cheshire East) and to two former local MPs, Lord Hoyle of Warrington and Lord Carlisle of Bucklow. (24) Their involvement in this issue, particularly between March and September 1998, was extensive and significant, particularly in negotiating access to various Ministers and DfEE officials.

The initial period of uncertainty surrounding the legitimacy of the case to allow Warrington Collegiate Institute to continue to use the University College title immediately following the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education was brief.

On 3 June 1998, the Director, Higher Education at the DfEE, C. A. Clark, had issued to the SCOP Executive Secretary notification of the amendments to the Teaching and Higher Education Bill setting out the detailed implications for institutional title and explaining that the Government, after initially not proposing immediate legislative action, had subsequently come to the view that immediate primary legislation was necessary to end the

confusion in the use of unauthorised names and to introduce clear statutory prohibition on the use of institutional titles which were not approved by Statute or Royal Charter. (25)

Recognising for several months prior to this notification that the range of options available to enable the organisation to retain the title was narrowing considerably, Warrington Collegiate Institute pursued several courses of action concurrently.

First, a series of meetings was arranged, involving at different times, Ministers, DfEE officials, Institute senior managers and a range of leading figures from the Warrington community, in an attempt to clarify the position and explore the range of options available to the institution. On 22 September, 1998 a delegation from Warrington, comprising the Principal, the Chair of the College Governors, the Chief Executive of Warrington Borough Council, Leader of Warrington Borough Council, Helen Jones, MP, Helen Southworth MP and Mike Hall, the MP for Weaver Vale, met with George Mudie, Minister of State and David Burbridge, a senior DfEE official with responsibility for higher education. From a generally positive meeting, the main outcome was an agreement that representatives from Warrington Collegiate Institute and the DfEE should meet to consider in detail the various options available to enable the continued use of the University College title.

On 19 October, 1998 the Principal and Chief Executive of Warrington Collegiate Institute and the Dean of University College met with senior DfEE officials. It was reaffirmed that the Commencement Order would take effect on 1 February, 1999, preventing institutions which did not meet the conditions set out in the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998

from continuing to use the University College title, that its provisions would be universally applied, and that extenuation would not be considered. (26) Other important clarifications were provided which confirmed the extent to which status considerations were informing the policy. Although legally, taught degree awarding powers were available to any institution (including private institutions) it was clear that the Institute would be unlikely to be successful regardless of the quality of its provision since the DfEE and the Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency would be concerned about the precedent which would be set by a Further Education College attaining these powers. (27)

In fact, the seeking of independent taught degree awarding powers was not the route to the retention of the title preferred by the Institute since it would involve severing the links with the University of Manchester which remain close and highly valued.

Importantly, it was evident from these discussions that, whilst corporate status was a principal factor in determining eligibility to use the university college title, status in the wider sense was an important, though tacit, consideration.(see note 15).

As a consequence of these discussions, and corresponding to the options being explored concurrently with legal advisors and the University of Manchester, the development of a federal relationship with the University, whilst maintaining separate funding and structures of accountability, emerged as a possible mechanism to enable the Institute to comply with the legislation and to allow University College, Warrington to retain the title. DfEE officials, although not expressing a clear view of the concept 'federal' and its structural,

legal, constitutional and management implications, held the view that federation represented the most viable option if the university college title was to be retained by the institution. (28)

The Institute engaged in lengthy consultation with legal advisors, initially seeking leading counsel's opinion which, referring to the 1904 Royal Charter incorporating the University of Manchester, concluded:

> *'There is no power under that Charter authorising Warrington Collegiate Institute's use of the appellation or designation 'University'. Additionally, insofar as the 1993 Agreement relies on General regulation XV and Ordinance XX as constituting the legitimate source of any such power, I do not believe these norms create the relevant jurisdiction. Accordingly, it seems to me that Warrington Collegiate Institute falls outside Section 39 (1) (a) of the 1998 Act and that, if the designation 'University College' is to remain legitimate then the approval of the Privy Council will be required.'*

> (Legal Opinion: Robert Jay QC, 13 August, 1998).

The legal advice also commented on the extreme difficulties of challenging the sovereignty of Parliament in primary legislation and that any attempts to compare and assimilate the constitutional position of the University of London and the University of Wales would be likely to prove fruitless. Nonetheless, extensive research was undertaken and further legal advice established a range of available options including: (i) acquisition of the higher education work of Warrington Collegiate Institute (essentially, a take-over of University College Warrington) by the University of Manchester; (ii) extended use of the University of Manchester name; (iii) a legal challenge to the DfEE by the University of Manchester regarding its use of Charter powers; (iv) the development of a federal relationship with the

University of Manchester; and (v) a new corporate structure for Warrington Collegiate Institute. (29)

It became evident in the discussions with senior staff from the University of Manchester that some of these options were not feasible. (30) The lack of clarity regarding the nature of federated status was compounded by the confusion as to whether the whole of Warrington Collegiate Institute or merely its higher education provision within University College would be the subject of the federal agreement. The Principal commented:

> *'It did appear from the DfEE's perspective these....(federal)...alternatives would be easier to pursue if we were two separate colleges...I am very disturbed that we could go to such drastic lengths simply to secure the University College title, lengths which would undermine our fundamental mission....The Government is so strongly supportive of lifelong learning, wider access and closer partnership...and yet...is apparently opposed to this being fully recognised within one institution, via a University College title'*

(Letter from the Principal to
the Chief Executive of
Warrington Borough Council,
27 October, 1998).

Whilst a number of options requiring fundamental constitutional or corporate change were thus unacceptable to the Institute, it became evident that some were equally unacceptable to the University of Manchester, notably full acquisition of the Institute by the University or the challenge to the DfEE regarding the legitimate use of its Charter powers. At a meeting of senior staff of the two institutions on 30 November 1998, it was agreed that the detailed constitutional, managerial and administrative implications of a federal relationship should be explored and clarified. It was concluded that the closer association in marketing terms and the use of the name of the University of Manchester would be the most effective

basis on which the two institutions would be able publicly to express their close

relationship until a more permanent solution of this kind could be established and agreed.

However, it was evident that the detailed exploration of a closer federal relationship would

not be possible in the time available, given the 1 February deadline for the introduction of

the Commencement Order preventing institutions which did not meet the criteria specified

in the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 from continuing to use the University

College title. Effectively, the campaign by Warrington Collegiate Institute to retain the

designation University College for its higher education work appeared to be ended.

Nonetheless, serving to confirm the value and strength of the political lobby as an aspect

of the decision-making process, demonstrated clearly by the historical account of the

development of many of the (now) mainstream universities in Chapter 3, on 21 January

1999 the DfEE informed the Principal of Warrington Collegiate Institute that:

> '....(following).... the Institute's request for more time to pursue its
> discussions with the University of Manchester before the new legislation on
> university college titles is applied to it... the Secretary of State has decided
> in these special circumstances he is prepared to recommend Privy Council
> approval of continued use by Warrington of a 'university college' title for a
> short period while further discussions between Warrington and Manchester
> take place.'
>
> > (Letter from C.A. Clark, Director, Higher
> > Education, DfEE to the Principal, Warrington
> > Collegiate Institute, 21, January, 1999).

The reaction from the sector was predictable and rapid. The SCOP Chairman wrote to the

Secretary of State expressing

> '....the bafflement of members of SCOP who have removed the words
> University College from their titles, a process with very significant costs
> both financial and reputational... The DfEE has not made clear the nature
> of the circumstances in which similar dispensation might have been made,

allowing other colleges a reprieve, whilst negotiations with their validating universities unfolded. '

(Tysome, T. 1999. *Blunkett Title Ruling Baffles Principals.* The Times Higher Education Supplement. 26 February: 2).

Institutional responses were equally critical of these developments. In a comment to the Times Higher Education Supplement, the Administrative Secretary at Liverpool Hope College (its legal title from 1 February) described the Warrington reprieve as a

'....back-door arrangement.... (indicating).... a department in disarray over this issue'

(Tysome, T. 1999. *Blunkett Title Ruling Baffles Principals.* The Times Higher Education Supplement. 19 February).

By virtue of the anomalies created by this exceptional status, Warrington Collegiate Institute, was transformed from a virtually isolated organisation conducting a lone campaign to defend its position, into the adversary of the sector agencies and individual institutions, aggrieved at their loss of title and status and the vagaries of a political process which accommodated such inconsistencies in policy implementation. This hostility towards University College Warrington could only have been attributable to a sense that, whatever the merits of the case of the higher education colleges, a further education college, by means of a clear strategy, a well-presented case and a strong political campaign had achieved a breakthrough in the University College title issue

6.7 Summary and Conclusions

This case study has provided clear evidence of the strong parallels between the history, growth and development of Warrington Collegiate Institute and the range of university colleges examined in Chapter 3 of the thesis. The analysis of four main perspectives on the nature and work of University College Warrington and its response to the threat posed by the loss of university college title: its history and development; institutional profile; its relationship with external agencies; and the political campaign in which it engaged to maintain its title, has highlighted the similarities of circumstance and contrasts of outcome which have characterised decisions relating to changes in institutional status in the pre-Robbins higher education sector, as against those affecting an individual institution in the 1990s, concluding that corporate (and therefore sector) status, rather than historical precedent or legitimacy based on educational, social or community grounds, has been a predominant consideration in the establishment and differential application of the criteria relating to the use of University College title.

The case study has also provided the clearest illustration of the failure to recognise the complexities of institutional mission, purpose and structure represented by the term University College. Significantly, the evidence has suggested that the consequences of preventing higher education institutions from using the title 'University College' have been damaging, and the issue of corporate and sector status has, beyond this, denied to certain institutions in the further education sector access to the means of fulfilling the criteria established for its legitimate use without radical change to their organisational structure,

governance and funding, with the prospect of the permanent loss of the title and status of University College.

The case study has captured, within a single institutional context, a series of important issues relating to the central thesis. Firstly, it has shown directly how a particular institution has responded to the social, economic, and demographic pressures which are continuing to form a new agenda for educational change and which has, in the process, through the issue of University College title, confronted the traditional values and structures of an elite system. Secondly, it has shown that the source of the opposition to the continued use of the University College title by the institution has been based on status considerations rather than the substantive issues of the nature and quality if its educational provision. Thirdly, the case study demonstrates the significance for an individual institution of the failure of (particularly the Dearing Committee) to resolve the issue of institutional title and status, less still to initiate the major structural reform of the higher education sector in the interests of meritocratic social mobility, social justice and educational opportunity. Fourthly, it is clear from the case study that the failure to resolve the anomalies of institutional positioning arising from the largely piecemeal and unstructured development of the higher education sector has created an ambiguous policy environment which not merely confuses individual institutions and their respective Missions but threatens the successful fulfilment of the lifelong learning agenda and inclusive education which is a prominent feature of current government policy.

Notes

1. Letter from C.A. Clark, Director, Higher Education to the Principal, Warrington Collegiate Institute. 21 January 1999.

2. The Secretary of State later confirmed that other institutions may be granted a similar dispensation. Times Higher Education Supplement. 26n February, 1999; 1)

3.. This was the reaction of the Principal, communicated to an open meeting of staff, held on 25 January 1999, to advise them of the outcome.

4. The term 'civic' universities itself denotes the provincial context from which many of the most prestigious English universities have developed. Many authors have reflected this common theme. W.B. Gallie, (1960) in examining the establishment of Keele University, refers to the liberal paternalism and civic pride reminiscent of Victorian England. C.G. Robertson (1944) maintains that at the basis of the establishment of each of the major civic universities was an individual provincial ethos, civic pride and a tradition and men of wealth to whom a 'local' civic institution could make a 'patriotic' appeal. N.F.B.Allington and N.J. O'Shaughnessy (1992) also referred to provincial rivalry and liberal benefactors playing a significant role in the establishment and success of the older civic universities.

   The historical analysis provided in Chapter 3 shows the importance of political advocacy in the establishment and development of English universities from the close association of Matthew Arnold and William Bagehot with the formation of the University of London through the range of civic universities to the modern day with the establishment of Keele University attributed in significant measure to the advocacy of Lindsay (Gallie, 1960).

5. During the debate regarding the appropriate volume of higher education work as a proportion of the whole within an organisation, a figure of 55%, originally proposed by CVCP, became the subject of extensive debate. This figure was identified in a briefing paper prepared by SCOP for as meeting with DfEE as a figure which had been agreed with CVCP. (SCOP, November 1997: 3). This, despite the comments of a former SCOP Chairman, Dr. J. Burke, suggesting that the figure should be higher than 55% (Santanelli, P. Times Higher Education Supplement. 30 June 1995: 12).

6. During the lengthy consultation on the University College title issue the bishops of Ripon and Leeds proposed a set of six criteria which the Secretary of State should use to determine the legitimate claim to the title. The criteria were that a University College:

   - is empowered to award the degrees of a recognised United Kingdom University;
   - has a relationship with its university which goes beyond affiliation or association and includes representation on senate and council;
   - has its university's approval for the title;
   - has Higher Education Funding Council and Quality Council approval for the quality of its higher education;
   - has maintained this quality over a range of courses and qualifications;
   - has chosen a title which is not confusing

   These proposals met with strong opposition from SCOP which criticised the criteria as '...divisive' and CVCP which described them as '...loosely worded, vague and wrong in some places' (Santanelli, P. Times Higher Education Supplement. 9 June 1995).

7. This sense of injustice is the most consistent feature of the extensive correspondence on this issue over several years. The logic which has supported the defence of its position has barely disguised

the emotional attachment which the Institute and the community have to fully recognised and appropriately designated higher education provision within Warrington.

8.   In the period following the major restructuring of teacher education in the 1970s many former teacher training colleges closed (e.g. Madeley in Staffordshire), whilst others amalgamated with neighbouring universities (e.g. Holly Bank with the University of Huddersfield) to become teacher education faculties.

9.   The significance of political influence is evident from the approach of the two local MPs during the conduct of this debate.   As members of the Labour Government elected in 1995 for the first time, they exerted a significant degree of political influence in support of the Institute's case..

10.   Higher Education Funding Council *Recurrent Funding Lists* (HEFCE, 1999).

11.   The HEFCE consultation paper proposed that
           '....*a discount should be applied to FE Colleges because the Further Education Funding*
           Council is responsible for their infrastructure, capital and non-staff related overheads.
           The discount...(will be applied on)....a sliding scale: from 20 per cent, for those with 10
           per cent of HE provision or less, to 5 per cent, for those with 35 per cent or more'
                                              (Higher Education Funding Council for
                                              England. Circular 21/96 'Funding Method for
                                              Teaching from 1998-99' 1996: Paragraph 35)

12.   In 1997 FEFC/HEFCE jointly commissioned a study by KPMG in which the Institute was involved which attempted to assess the relative costs of delivering higher education in higher education and further education institutions.   The report entitled *'The Comparative Costs of Higher Education Provision in FE Colleges and Higher Education Institutions'* (KPMG, 1998) was inconclusive, showing no differential pattern of costs attributable in the selected programme areas to either context.   Following the report HEFCE informally shelved the plans to implement Circular 21/96.

13.   A requirement of the funding for a recent joint Higher Education Funding Council and European Social Fund initiative specifically focused on the issue of widening participation, has been that any project should be co-ordinated by a university.   Further Education Corporations, regardless of their experience in delivering higher education and their institutional commitment to the principle of access and widening participation, could only obtain funding support through their collaborating university.

14.   This position was confirmed at a meeting between the Principal, Warrington Collegiate Institute, the Dean of University College and DfEE officials held at DfEE headquarters in London on 19 October, 1998.

15.   Beyond references to the (then) unpublished criteria for taught degree-awarding powers, David Burbridge suggested that this status was '...a matter of 'academic standing' and 'integrity' and related to the 'length of experience' and 'suitability of the institution'...' (Author's Notes of DfEE Meeting, 19 October 1998).

16.   Essentially a University College of the University of Manchester is required to:

       •   have normally been an affiliated institution of the University for a period of not less than
           five years;
       •   demonstrate a commitment to the development of HE and the involvement of staff in this
           development;
       •   have sufficient number of HE students to provide full quality of student life and
           experiences;

- have appropriate quality assurance systems for internal review and the development of new programmes;
- have appropriate procedures for sharing good practice in teaching and learning;
- have an institutional commitment to staff development;
- have an appropriate admissions policy;
- have committed resources to the welfare and other facilities for HE students.

(University of Manchester, 1996: 1).

17. The author, as Dean of University College, is a member of the University Senate, the University Graduate Standards and Quality Committee and its undergraduate equivalent, and the Faculty of Arts Graduate School and Research Committees.

18. The Academic Registrar, the Pro-Vice Chancellor and the Head of the Quality Unit have at various times written in support of the Institute in its campaign to retain the title.

19. It was a widely held view that the greatest opposition to the use of University College title was expressed by the Vice-Chancellors of the *post*-1992 universities which regarded the designation, and the status it conveyed, as a threat to the market position of the 'new' universities, significantly, to a greater extent than the pre-1992 universities. (Author's Notes: Interviews with College Principals, 1998).

20. Discussion with Tim Cox, (then) Executive Secretary of SCOP. 20 March 1998.

21. For example, the College was involved in correspondence with AGCAS, the Careers Advisory Service in Higher Education, which interpreted the corporate status of the Institute in such a way as to render it ineligible for full membership, suggesting that 'affiliate menbership' may be more appropriate (15 July, 1996). Further, correspondence was also received (31 July 1995) from the Cheshire Trading Standards Office (originating from the Northamptonshire Trading Standards Office) suggesting that the use of the University College title may be in breach of the Trades Descriptions Act 1968. This reference, interestingly, presaged the conclusions of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education which invoked the Business Names Act, 1988 in conjunction with the Further and Higher Education Act, 1992 as the basis of the legal restrictions on the use of University College title.

22. Several hundred letters were sent to local MPs by supporters of the campaign expressing the strong sense of injustice and dismay at the Government's response to the Report of the Dearing Inquiry, seeking to prevent the Institute from continuing to use a title which so clearly and accurately described the level and quality of its work and its relationship with the University of Manchester.

23. The Principal had contacted Professor Simon Lee, Rector and Chief Executive of Liverpool Hope University College (16 March 1998), Dr. John Cater, Principal Edge Hill University College (16 March 1998) and Mr. D. J. Mortimer, Principal, University College Suffolk (30 March, 1998) to ascertain what course of action they were proposing in the face of the threat to institutional title.

24. In 1997, Lord Hoyle of Warrington and Lord Carlisle of Bucklow became Fellows of Warrington Collegiate Institute. These appointments were made in recognition of their service to the Warrington community and to the College.

25. This letter from C.A. Clark Director, Higher Education, DfEE to Mr. T. Cox, Executive Secretary, SCOP. 3 June, 1998 for wider distribution to the SCOP institutions, set out the proposed amendments to the Teaching and Higher Education Bill).

26. The issue of principle aside, the imposition of the 1 February deadline (to take account of the publication cycle for institutional prospectuses) created a serious and clearly unexpected logistical

problem for those institutions anticipating that a successful application for taught degree-awarding powers would enable them to retain the University College title since the criteria were not available at that time. The criteria were, in fact, not published until March 1999 (consultation draft) following a lengthy period of consultation. Since no institution would be allowed to retain the title in anticipation of a successful application, unless a decision on those applications in the system was made prior to I February 1999, those institutions would fail to meet the criteria for the continued use of the University College title. It was evident that the Quality Assurance Agency and the DfEE had not consulted on the implementation of a 1 February deadline and the implications for institutions.

The delay in agreeing and publishing the criteria effectively meant that any institution which had applied for taught degree-awarding powers since 25 February 1998 (in direct response to the need to meet the recommendations of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education) would be forced to relinquish the University College title, perhaps to have it reinstated at a later date upon the granting of taught degree awarding powers. The late publication of the criteria for degree awarding powers was to constitute the basis of the judicial review process initiated by Liverpool Hope University College.

27.   Author's notes of the meeting with DfEE officials. 19 October, 1998.

28.   The DfEE officials could not provide a model of institutional collaboration to demonstrate how federation might be applied in the current situation but cited the Welsh model and the recent merger of Roehampton Institute with the University of Surrey, neither of which were applicable in this instance. It was clear that the DfEE was seeking proposals from the sector which would then be considered by the Department in the light, it was presumed, of implicit criteria (Endnote 15 above) .

29.   Warrington Collegiate Institute Internal Report of a meeting on 23 November 1998 involving the Principal of Warrington Collegiate Institute, the Dean of University College, and representatives of Mills and Reeve, Solicitors, 24 November.

The new structure would involve Warrington Collegiate Institute (as the parent institution) establishing two subsidiary companies, one of which would be responsible for its further education work, with an equivalent for its higher education work. This would, it was suggested, avoid the need for a full de-merger of Warrington Collegiate Institute's interest...it would also avoid the need to seek the Secretary of State's approval under Warrington Collegiate Institute's Instruments of Government...(for)... a formal change of name as it would be the subsidiary company adopting a name, rather than a change of Warrington Collegiate Institute's name.

30.   A meeting was held at the University of Manchester on 30 November to consider the range of options presented in the report from G. Attle, Mills and Reeve (24 November). Present at the meeting were the Principal and Chief Executive of Warrington Collegiate Institute, the Dean of University College, and from the University of Manchester, the Academic Registrar and the Pro-Vice Chancellor with special responsibility for affiliated institutions.

Chapter 7

Conclusions

7.1 Introduction

The preceding analysis has sought to explore from a range of perspectives and utilising a variety of methodological tools, the changing position of University Colleges in the higher education firmament. The analysis has focused on the origins, nature and impact of the decisions relating to the development of this disparate group of institutions in order to examine the central thesis which maintained that the existing pattern of institutional providers of higher education and the basis on which it has developed, has progressively failed to resolve the tension between the increasing educational, social, political, economic and cultural demands to widen access and extend educational opportunity, and the conflicting pressure to preserve the existing framework of institutional and sector hierarchies based on reputational status. The investigation has been organised according to four central analytical perspectives-historical, policy, sectoral and institutional-which consequently form the structure for presentation of the conclusions.

7.2 The Historical Perspective

Kearney (1973) reminds us that historians can make a contribution to discussion of stability and change in higher education since in looking ahead it is impossible not to be influenced by the past, if only by reaction against it. Whilst this is contrary to the postmodern perspective, the historical perspective in this study has provided an essential basis from which to examine issues of status and structural change in higher education. The historical dimension of this study has comprised two elements: an historical review of

selected aspects of the higher education sector; and the analysis of the approaches and outcomes of the two major reviews of higher education undertaken in the last thirty five years, the Robbins Committee and the Dearing Inquiry. The first element has sought to respond to a number of research questions relating to the extent to which: longevity and tradition, as the basis of the reputational status of the university sector, is a myth or a reality; whether the historical development of the university sector reflects the structured, planned and rational formation and development of a university 'system' or the piecemeal, unsystematic growth of individual institutions; and to what extent institutional and community aspiration, political, social, educational and cultural pressures, individual influence and financial constraints have been significant features in the historical development of the university sector.

This analysis has demonstrated the unstructured nature of the growth and development of various sectors of higher education and the idiosyncratic and fortuitous influences in the establishment and successful development of many of the (now) mainstream universities (based on patronage, political influence and the educational, social and economic pressures arising from an increased sense of community aspiration). This has shown that the assumption of common aims and standards, common histories, pedagogies and status based on longevity and tradition, endorsed by centuries of usage and experience and centred on the collegiate model exemplified by Oxford and Cambridge, is invalid as the defining framework for the significant majority of universities. It is also damaging when this (mis)perception forms a basis for the future pattern of the higher education system (Bell, 1973). The historical perspective has shown the assertion of tradition as a justification for

252

the maintenance of status distinctions between institutions of higher education to be largely false and the nostalgia for a 'golden age' of higher education (in fact, the universities) to be misplaced. The elitist *sanctum* which has continued to influence the debate and the politics of higher education reform has, it seems, perpetuated a myth about the historical status of universities which has caused successive generations of aspiring university institutions to be overshadowed by this elitist conception of the university. In this important sense, developing Scott's (1995a) questioning of the terms 'old' and 'new' universities, the historical analysis here supports the view that the expansion of the university sector in post-Robbins era (including the establishment of the Polytechnics and their transformation into universities in the early 1990s) has produced 'new' universities in the temporal and perhaps organisational, rather than in the conceptual sense, since the accepted definitions of the conditions for entry, the curricula and the balance of learning between research and teaching were perpetuated, mimicked, confirming that the idea of the university (i) was legitimised precisely through its association with the '...*magic of the ancient English universities*' (Halsey, 1984: 130). This influence was clear from the various policy initiatives which established the 'plateglass' universities in the 1960s and particularly those which attributed university status to former Polytechnic sector in the early 1990s in producing a '....*comic pattern of return to medieval symbols.*' (ibid.).

This historical perspective has reaffirmed the view that a university 'system', *qua* system, does not exist (Shattock,1996). It also supports the view that there is little evidence that the boundaries between the university and the rest of higher education have been finally and convincingly drawn (Bell, 1973) since the history of the development of higher

253

education institutions in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries provides evidence of substantial change, little of which, however, may be regarded as *systematic* (that is, consistent, universal and based on a clear sector-wide strategy for the whole of higher education), or *radical* (that is, designed to replace elitism with meritocracy, privilege with social justice as the main organising concepts of higher education).

7.3   The Policy Analysis Perspective

The first element of the historical analysis has demonstrated clearly that the development of the higher education sector has been piecemeal, unstructured and unsystematic, both *ad hoc* and *ad hominem*. (2)   This is significant in the context of the policy analysis perspective, which has examined the work of the two most influential committees of inquiry into higher education in recent years, the Robbins Committee and the Dearing Inquiry, since the remit of both was concerned to respond to the pressures to expand and to consider the size, structure and shape of higher education required to meet rapidly changing individual and societal needs.   This element of the analysis explored the extent to which: the historical perspective set out in the earlier part of the thesis with regard to the structural development of the sector and the changing status of institutions within it, informed the judgements of the Robbins Committee and the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and how far political and status considerations influenced their respective reports; and, in what way the recommendations of the committees of inquiry responded to the pressures to expand the higher education system and to extend educational opportunity to previously under-represented groups.

First, the analysis has demonstrated that the two committees of inquiry, in considering the future role of the university colleges, failed to take account of the historical development of the higher education sector and the manner in which institutions which had borne this title now form the core of the university sector on which the high reputation of British (particularly in this context, English) higher education has been built. The historical evidence of the unstructured and unsystematic transformation of university colleges, traditionally dependent on the progressively unwieldy and unstable, inappropriate and over-stretched management arrangements of the University of London, into full-fledged universities was neglected by both committees of inquiry. Although Robbins recognised the importance of an evolving system and the need to establish a structure which encouraged institutions to develop and extend, and the translation into universities of the Colleges of Advanced Technology was an example in practice of the concept of 'promotion' (Niblett, Humphreys and Fairhurst, 1975), the arguments which the Committee applied in opposing the establishment of a 'new' type of institution, the University College, failed even to recognise their previous existence. In the case of the Dearing Inquiry, the context in which the issue of the role and status of the university colleges was examined was significantly different, with pressure having being brought to bear by successive Secretaries of State and elements of the university sector to resolve the anomalies of institutional title which were in evidence. As demonstrated clearly in this study, this resulted not merely in the failure to recognise the historical role and status of this group of institutions, but led to provisions in the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 in relation to institutional title and status which failed to acknowledge the complexity of the higher education sector and the extent to which, legitimately and necessarily in

response to significant expansion, the range of providers has grown, become more diffuse and differentiated. This has generated problems which continue to reverberate around the sector in its reflections on the consistency of the policy implementation.

In focusing on the extent to which the historical dimension of institutional and sector development and its impact on the current structure have informed the approaches and outcomes of the work of these two bodies, this study has demonstrated that the status considerations which continue to influence the development, nature and pace of change in higher education remain significant. The analysis has shown that the Robbins Committee reflected, and to some extent attempted to take account of, these influences, thereby diminishing the potential of the Committee to radicalise the sector based on the continuous re-definition of the potentially educable according to the concepts of democratic access and social justice rather than elite values. The Dearing Inquiry, more overtly, reflected the concerns relating to institutional title and status but recommended primary legislation to sweep away the anomalies which had become a source of concern to successive Secretaries of State and some parts of the higher education sector in the context of the debate relating to quality and standards and the threat to market and sector position posed by the perceived, unconstrained, 'status drift' of some higher education and further education institutions. Neither approach was likely to prove successful in reconciling, in structural terms, the individual, social, and economic pressures for both increased and widened participation, all of which were acknowledged, and in some cases defined, by the committees of inquiry, with the self-stabilising value systems and structures of an elite

system and the perceptions of status and hierarchy based on tradition and longevity, often misconceived and ill-founded, which perpetuate them.

Secondly, although in different ways failing to provide structural solutions, both committees addressed directly the question of the expansion of higher education. Although the Robbins Report recognised that excellence and equity are not mutually exclusive in suggesting that

> '....it is a mistake to regard the claims of quantity and quality as being in
> conflict. Regard for the former is a safeguard against the waste of talent;
> regard for the latter is a guarantee of the worth and merit of the whole. '
> (Robbins, 1963: 266),

one view has suggested that the meritocratic impulses on which its programme was based represented merely a mildly expansionary tendency stimulated by eccentric post-war and 1950s demography supported by a marginally more generous social conception of the educability of the population, still contained within elitist assumptions resulting in the consolidation of Victorian expansion rather than the beginning of mass higher education (Halsey, 1984). The assumption underlying the expansion of higher education in the 1960s was that traditional criteria of excellence would be upheld (Neave, 1985). For Scott (1988), however:

> 'The commanding achievement of Robbins which even the harshest critics
> have had to respect, is that its report endorsed and encouraged the
> expansion of higher education. ...the essential continuity between its
> prescriptions and the effective outcomes, the particular development of
> British higher education over the past 25 years, is underestimated. '
> (Scott, 1988: 35).

Equally some regarded the Robbins Report, which justified and charted the expansion of British higher education, as also having served to limit the growth of the system by

affirming the values and assumptions of an elite system incompatible with the provision of mass higher education (Trow, 1989: 55). From this perspective the post-Robbins expansion is regarded as a failed thrust towards a mass system (Halsey, 1992). The gradually expanding higher education system, post-Robbins, sought to retain its elite values (Lawson, 1999) which significantly restricted its capacity to create the conditions and structures for mass higher education.

The Dearing Inquiry received concerted support from the sector and associated agencies for the further expansion of higher education, confirming views which had been expressed immediately following the announcement of the period of consolidation in the mid-1990s which had resulted from the realisation that in allowing institutions to expand at marginal cost the Government had established an uncapped commitment to pay both fees and maintenance to the additional students which threatened to overwhelm the public purse. (Watson and Taylor, 1998). The extent of the further expansion advocated and the time period varied according to the source. The Confederation of British Industry argued for a minimum graduation target of 40% by the year 2000 (CBI, 1994), as did the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP, 1995). The Council for Industry and Higher Education was suggesting 50-66% (CIHE, 1995). The National Union of Students argued for a target of 50% within two decades (NUS, 1996). Therefore, although the Dearing Inquiry was established immediately following the most significant expansion in the history of British higher education, with total enrolments in the period 1986-1995 increasing by 80%, full time first-degree students doubling from 428 to 861 thousand and the number of part-time postgraduate students rising from 52 to 182 thousand (Smithers

and Robinson, 1996: 2), the demand for further expansion was unabated. Significantly, in reviewing this position, the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education reverted to the Robbins principles as the organising framework for the massive consultation exercise on which the Report was based (Dearing, 1997). Robertson (1995) had previously maintained that

> *'If the Robbins principles are to form the basis of a reformation of the purposes of higher education.....are these to be the purposes of an expanded but culturally unreconstituted higher education - as the shift by volume from elite to mass volume may imply-or are we to define the purposes of higher education in other terms - as the shift from elite to democratic would imply.'*

> (Robertson, 1995: 49)

Robertson (1995) argued the case for the extension of these central principles to take account of the provision of lifetime learning and the concept of higher education as a service to communities. In maintaining the view of the purposes of higher education established by the Robbins Committee, a view based on traditional values and structures, innately conservative and elitist in conception, the Dearing Inquiry, as with the Robbins Committee previously (though perhaps to a lesser degree), effectively became reliant on the adaptive capacity of existing organisations and structural frameworks to deliver whatever changes were proposed, confirming the sharply peaked hierarchy which isolates a group of institutions in elite positions (Clark, 1983: 256). This also ensured that the phenomenon of 'academic drift' (an issue placed on the Dearing agenda by Gillian Shephard, the [then] Secretary of State) which was to some extent inevitable in the pursuit of higher standards and the perceived status, respect and rewards which accrue, [3] would continue unless a regulatory device could be established to prevent it. Consequently, the Dearing Inquiry, rather than focusing attention on the structural changes which would

enable the further expansion of the sector and the fundamental principles by which it should be governed, concentrated on responding to the concerns of those institutions whose status and market position was threatened by the unregulated growth and development of institutions outside the mainstream university sector. The issue was expressed in the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education as a concern about 'mission convergence' (NCIHE, Main Report. Para. 16.11: 251) and the Committee focused attention on the diversity of the sector and the pattern of institutions providing higher education. Diversity was regarded by the Committee as an unqualified virtue (ibid., Para. 16.5: 249) and the Report was critical of government, funding councils and professional bodies for creating an environment (particularly in respect of funding) which increased the homogeneity and uniformity of the system. The Committee was also critical of institutions which had sought to spread (in order to reduce risk) their mission-based objectives (ibid., Para. 3.90: 92), the result in sector terms being the convergence of organisational missions (Watson and Taylor, 1998). Therefore, whilst emphasising the long term strategic aim of responding to increased demand for higher education, the Dearing Inquiry, in seeking to establish a regulatory device to restrict 'mission convergence' and 'academic drift' recommended the channelling of provision through a clear pattern of institutions, differentiated by status, title and mission to promote a disciplined diversity of provision (NCIHE: 248-263).

The two Committees, to different degrees but for similar reasons, have therefore served *structurally* to perpetuate social inequality and to restrict social and educational

opportunity by failing to question the deep-rooted and self-perpetuating status hierarchy on which the elitist model of higher education has been founded.

7.4   The Sectoral Perspective

Becher and Kogan (1992) maintain that the notion of a system of higher education implies

> '....a degree of organisational tidiness which is very rarely achieved in practice. In common with most other social institutions , the shape of higher education is as much a consequence of historical accretion and continuing transactions across institutional boundaries as it is of long term rational planning'
>
> (Becher and Kogan, 1992: 2).

The analysis of the university college sector in its current form confirms the significance of the historical development of the sector in determining its current shape and also demonstrates clearly the inconsistencies, anomalies of status, title and sector position of a range of higher education providers.

It is argued that the non-university component of higher education, although existing for more than a century disguised under the system of external degrees, remained largely hidden from public view until the establishment of the binary policy and that the expansion of higher education has separated the concept of higher education from any particular institutional instantiation of it (Barnett, 1985: 242).   It is evident that the university sector has never been monolithic. Many more differences exist than the levelling rhetoric of national policy-making allows, and the evolution of the binary policy has witnessed a changing perception of the non-university sector 'first as residual, then as complementary, later as alternative and now as rival' (Scott, 1990: 20).

Trow (1998) has argued that the recommendations of the Dearing Report are fundamentally flawed and that

> '....The Report does not show an intimate knowledge of the institutions about which it advises...it ignores the wide diversity of higher education institutions, subjects and students in making its sweeping recommendations...For these and other reasons, the Report is now one of the many problems facing British higher education rather than part of their solution.'
>
> (Trow, 1998: 93)

The analysis undertaken in Chapter 5 of the thesis in attempting to construct a single 'map' of the university college sector confirms that the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education in making its recommendations regarding the pattern of institutions offering higher education, and the status and title which attaches to them, and indeed, the DfEE, in framing that part of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998, failed to address the complexity, largely historically derived, of the university college sector.

The analysis shows that, in the absence of a clear set of criteria to define the inclusion of certain types of institutions within the group of university colleges, it is not possible to construct a single 'map' of the university college sector. Since the criteria are contested, the rationality applied from one set of perspectives appears from another to generate anomaly and inconsistency. There are no completely inclusive criteria available satisfactorily to rectify all the existing anomalies. The examination of the three sub-sectors of higher education, the universities, higher education colleges and further education identifies that such inconsistencies apply across the whole of higher education wherever the title University College is used.

262

The attempt by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education to establish a set of criteria to define the legitimate use of the University College title (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. Para.16.27-16.31: 256-257) based on the attainment of degree-awarding powers or (equally contentiously) by virtue of being an integral part of a federal university structure, have served to highlight the existing anomalies and, indeed, to compound the confusion of status and sector position of some institutions bearing the title University College. This is particularly the case with regard to the relationship between those institutions whose status and structure the recommendations sought to preserve and protect unaltered, for example, the University of London and the University of Wales, and those institutions which carried the University College title with the (implicit or explicit) agreement of their particular university partner since the Report questioned if not the right, since the Committee did not feel competent to pronounce on this, certainly the wisdom of using charter powers in respect of colleges of higher education, and, ultimately, the appropriateness of their use in respect of further education colleges issue (NCIHE. Main Report Para. 16.31: 256). It is in this pronouncement, perhaps more than any, that the Dearing Committee demonstrated most clearly its recognition and acceptance of the concerns which had been expressed through the consultation process by those representative bodies (considered in Chapter 3) within the higher education sector which were critical of the perceived 'academic drift' within and across the sub-sectors of higher education. In its commitment to remedying the weakening in responsibility and self-discipline exercised by some institutions (ibid., Para. 16.15: 253), the recommendations in the Report and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 which

related to the use of institutional name and title, reflected in the clearest terms the inability of the policy advisors and opinion-formers to extend the policy-making agenda beyond the long-standing and deeply entrenched elitist foundation on which higher education has rested. The distinction which the Report and the legislation have drawn between the higher education and further education institutions in respect of the use of institutional title, defying the educational logic which currently prevails in the high level of collaboration between the sectors and individual institutions, has confirmed the extent to which political and status considerations, based either on elitist values or, at a more basic level, the protection of market position in an increasingly competitive environment, have determined the criteria for the continued use of the University College title, effectively re-establishing the 'binary line' between the higher education institutions and the further education sector involved in the provision of higher education.

The analysis undertaken in the attempt to construct the 'map' of the university college sector demonstrates, in support of Trow's (1998) argument, that neither the work of Robbins Committee nor (with less justification) that of the Dearing Inquiry was informed by a clear and consistent understanding of the complex composition of the university college sector, thereby undermining the validity of the recommendations emanating from the two Committees relating to the current and future role and sector position of university colleges.

Despite this, the recommendations and the aspects of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 relating to institutional title have had a profound effect at institutional level.

7.5 The Institutional Perspective

The institutional perspective in this study has been provided by a case study of a single institution which, in most significant respects, has been affected by the issues of title and status which are the central concerns of this thesis. The analysis of four main perspectives on the nature and work of University College Warrington and its response to the threat posed by the loss of university college title: its history and development; institutional profile; its relationship with external agencies; and the political campaign in which it engaged to maintain its title, has identified important parallels with the range of embryonic university institutions considered in Chapter 3 of the thesis and has demonstrated, by clear example, the similarities of circumstance and contrasts of outcome which have characterised decisions relating to changes in institutional status throughout the period of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The evidence provided by the case study affirms that corporate (and therefore sector) status, rather than historical precedent or legitimacy based on educational, social or community grounds, has been a predominant consideration in the establishment and differential application of the criteria relating to the use of University College title. The application of the recommendations of the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and their implementation in the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 have generated a series of status crises within a range of higher education providers both higher education colleges and further education institutions, to the extent that affected institutions are in the process of legal challenge through the system of Judicial Review (in the case of Liverpool Hope University College) or, in the case of Warrington Collegiate Institute, have been actively pursuing discussions

with its collaborating university and the DfEE to attempt to construct a set of organisational and governance arrangements to establish the federal relationship which would enable the Institute to continue to use the University College title without critically damaging its internal structure and independence.

The case study provides the micro-level analysis of the impact of the failure to recognise the complexities of institutional mission, purpose and structure represented by the term University College. The consequences of preventing higher education institutions from using the title 'University College' without prior fulfilment of the criteria relating either to federated status or the attainment of degree-awarding powers have been damaging. The issue of corporate and sector status which, beyond this, has denied to certain institutions in the further education sector access to the means of fulfilling the criteria established for its legitimate use without radical change to their organisational structure, governance and funding, with the prospect of the permanent loss of the title and status of University College, has created an untenable position to which the Secretary of State has responded by granting dispensation to Warrington Collegiate Institute (with the possibility of similar action in the case of other institutions) to continue to use the University College title for a period in order to allow discussions with the University of Manchester and the DfEE to proceed in pursuit of an acceptable settlement. It is important to note in this context that the most recent statement on the University College title, the Secretary of State has signalled the possibility of further education corporations applying for taught degree-awarding powers. It is evident from the preceding analysis that there are strong, demonstrable parallels between the history and development of Warrington Collegiate

Institute, its relationship with its parent university, its community base and the political campaign and these features of many of the institutions examined in Chapter 3 of the thesis. It is equally evident that the consideration of the changing status and aspirations of these institutions, at different times throughout the period of the history of the university colleges, has been subject to different, less restrictive, less bureaucratic, perspectives. Most significantly, in the case of Warrington Collegiate Institute, the criteria recommended by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the provisions of the Teaching and Higher Education Act 1998 precluding the use of University College title have presented an unresolved policy conflict when viewed against the correspondence between the organisational mission and the commitment of the Government to widening participation and extending access to educational opportunity.

7.6   The Future Policy Agenda

This investigation, although focusing on the issue of university college title and status has inevitably raised a series of wider concerns regarding the nature of change in higher education. The issue of the adaptive capacity of existing institutions, structural reform and the establishment of frameworks to respond to emergent mass, potentially universal, systems of higher education (Trow, 1964) has been considered from a range of perspectives.

Jary and Parker (1999) represent the dilemmas of mass higher education as a series of oppositional forces. [4]   Aspects of these forces may be briefly developed to represent the major stimuli to structural reform in higher education.

Firstly, with regard to the theory and practice of increased and widened access, the significant factor in this context is that the structural separation of various elements of post-compulsory education and the respective (perhaps excessive) celebration of autonomous traditions, has strengthened boundary observance between the levels and therefore different locations of educational provision (Croft and Bersesford, 1992). The politics of access and its relationship to social policy in pressing the transition to a more democratic form of higher education has a substantial literature ranging over a considerable period (Parry, 1986; Wright, 1991; Blackburn and Jarman, 1993; Smith, Scott and Mackay, 1993). For many authors, access is regarded as a rhetorical flourish rather than as a serious policy (Croft and Beresford, 1992) in which the range of access routes, modes and procedures has proliferated but whose impact on traditional entry has been slight and selective (Parry, 1986) and, indeed, damaging by diverting applicants from the direct entry (Tuckett, 1990).

Access courses,

> 'despite the obvious benefits they have brought to thousands of students,
> may assist the expansion of higher education but do little to transform it.'

(Smith, Scott and Mackay, 1993: 320)

It is, rather, *accessibility* which offers the prospect of expansion into a system which is '...beneficial, attractive, congenial and approachable to the whole population' (Wright, 1991: 6).). It is suggested that, while the argument for increased access has resulted in significant change, the argument for widened participation will require the integration of traditional and non-traditional provision (McPherson, 1991). Higher education, particularly in its more static institutional forms, has shown the adaptive capacity to

accommodate increased participation, but not the inclination to promote widened participation. Institutions and agencies in the University College sector have continually emphasised its distinctive contribution to access in a diverse system of higher education (SCOP, 1996; Lee, 1996; Warrington Collegiate Institute, 1996))

Secondly, and related, the issue of the democratisation of educational opportunity as an expression of the commitment to social justice, equity, individual choice and mobility (Robertson, 1995) has raised the issue of the reform of higher education to the level of a democratic (and therefore social and political) imperative in which a learning society is defined by its capacity to deliver social cohesion and social justice as well as economic prosperity to all its citizens (Coffield and Williamson, 1997: 3). This requires a fundamental redefinition of the relationship between universities and learners. As Robertson (1997) maintains elsewhere, in exhorting the universities to adopt the rigours of public service, including democratic accessibility and public accountability,

> '....attempts by universities to maintain the quality of an ancient elite model in the context of increased participation and a restructured labour market are producing an unappealing hybridization of form and purpose. The sector turns inward in search of intimacy and solace; while events beyond demand that universities face outwards to public accountability and responsiveness. The wider public looks on in confusion.'
> (Robertson, 1997: 76)

There are, however, numerous examples in the University College sector of institutions, particularly those with a denominational mission which have an expressed commitment to equality, and a concern which is reflected in their curriculum to promote social justice and the concept of citizenship (Council of Church and Associated Colleges, 1996; Lee, 1996)

Thirdly, the impetus to reform has been based on the analysis of the relationship of the higher education sector to the wider economy. Despite the perceived dissonance between the academic values of intellectual freedom and those of industry and commerce (Tasker and Packham, 1993), the source of this impetus has been based on: i) the analysis and prescription over several decades (Zuckerman, 1958; Roderick and Stephens, 1982; DES, 1985; Esland, 1991; Finegold and Soskice, 1993) of the failure of education and training to meet the needs of the economy; ii) reports from a range of sector agencies suggesting that the government plans and those of higher education for the education and training of the workforce are in conflict with the ambitions for national renewal and growth (Council for Industry and Higher Education, 1987); and iii) a range of studies examining and projecting the demand for graduates in the economy (Keep, 1996). Some analyses have identified considerable success for higher education in meeting the needs of a changing economy (Coffield, 1995: 8), whilst others suggest that the further expansion of higher education is better regarded as a form of consumption rather than as an investment and precondition for national prosperity (Murphy, 1993). Such analyses, for many decades, have provided a continuing focus on the reform of higher education, albeit from the somewhat narrow perspective of its role in fuelling economic success. Again, reference to the prospectuses of institutions within the University College sector show that many (merely to cite examples from the range of institutions whose Principals participated in this study, Warrington Collegiate Institute, Edge Hill, St. Martin's Lancaster, Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds) have distinctively vocational curricula designed specifically to respond to the needs of individual graduate career aspirations and the needs of employers and the

wider economy. Indeed, many have their origins in teacher education and have diversified whilst ensuring that the vocational emphasis remains.

Fourthly, the impetus to reform has been strengthened (arguably, initiated) by the perceived crisis in the institution of the university. The fundamental questioning of the role and purpose of higher education has challenged the ideological standing of the academy in its currently dominant model (Tight, 1989). This form of analysis has generated a substantial and wide-ranging debate emerging from the mid-nineteenth century (Newman, 1853), but which has recently intensified, relating to the idea of the university in its past, present and possible future guises (Oakeshott, 1950, in Fuller, 1989; Scott, 1984; 1993; Halsey, 1985; Barnett, 1985; 1993; Anderson, 1993; Sutherland, 1994; Shattock, 1995; Barnett and Griffin, 1997). The theme of crisis pervades this literature with universities regarded as suffering a decline of academic authority (Bauman, 1997), challenged by increasing sources of legitimate competing knowledge (Gibbons et.al.,1994), and as 'exploding communities' (Schuller, 1992) in a fragmented, post-modern universe (Smith and Webster, 1997). It is an indication of the extent of the hegemony of the university as a concept that the institution of the university and its form (rather than the idea of higher education) determines the nature of the discourse relating to the development of higher education generally. Structural reform if it is to be effective, and particularly if the valuable work of non-university providers of higher education in the 1990s is not to be swept aside, must extend beyond the mainstream universities. As Scott (1997) argues, the University College sector provides an alternative to the university institution as a means of participating in higher education. The University Colleges in

271

many instances provide a distinctive experience which is different to, but comparable with, universities. The crisis in the universities, whether real or imaginary, should not be taken to signify a crisis in higher education.

Finally, the lifelong learning agenda represents the most significant challenge to existing structures and institutions within higher education. It is in the commitment to lifelong learning that the University College sector has the most significant role to play as a central element of the higher education system. Watson and Taylor (1998) in a detailed analysis of lifelong learning and the role of the university, post-Dearing, argue that there are a number of key issues for the higher education sector in the fulfilment of this agenda. First, social class remains a determinant of entry to higher education demonstrating the uneven social equity performance of expansion (Dearing, 1997: Chart 7.1) and the disproportionate role of the former Polytechnics in the improvement of the participation rates. Secondly, the curriculum is changing from an '...undifferentiated linear lump...' (Watson and Taylor, 1998: 47) to a credit-based qualifications framework enabling students to access higher education on a more flexible basis and determine the pace of their study. This has profound consequences for the funding and organisation of higher education, sector-wide. Thirdly, the challenge to the traditional view of scholarship encapsulated in an influential group of essays (Gibbons et.al., 1994) emphasise the need for breadth and interdisciplinarity supported by collaborative approaches to curriculum development and research.. Fourthly, there are numerous substantial issues relating to the changing needs of students and the communities which universities serve.

In 1992 Miliband argued that higher education must adapt to the exigencies of economic and social change moving beyond a model of higher education based on division and selection to one designed to promote participation and achievement (Miliband, 1992: 6). The extent of the recent changes should, however, be noted. By 1997 there were more students enrolled with the Open University, or following courses of higher education in further education colleges than in the entire university system at the time of Robbins (Robertson, 1997) According to the most recently available statistics there are approaching two million students following higher education courses (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 1999). In the process there has been a fundamental re-designing of curricula and management structures and, although class inequalities remain, the universities, particularly, have simultaneously nurtured social, cultural and political elites and created opportunities for meritocratic social mobility. (Coffield and Williamson, 1997).

However, the pre-existing demarcations between higher and further education, initial and continuing, academic and vocational and recreational remain embedded in organisational and sector structures. In 1995, Sir Christopher Ball foresaw a thousand British universities before the end of the twenty-first century (Duke, 1997: 60). It is evident, however, that currently the title and status are guarded not merely by the old and ancient universities but by those institutions which have only recently joined the ranks of the university sector, displaying histories and organisational profiles which, as the early parts of this study have shown, correspond closely to those of institutions which they now seek

to exclude. Furthermore, university college title and status, adopted with such ease and freedom by these institutions which now cloak themselves in the tradition and *gravitas* of a university reputation, is denied to a range of higher education providers whose curriculum, client groups, community relationships and public service ethos fulfil more obviously and readily the lifelong learning agenda for the current and future generations. The inequities in such an approach to institutional status and aspiration pose a threat to the fulfilment of this policy agenda

In the post-binary world, since the transformation into universities of the former Polytechnics, higher education has tended to become synonymous with the universities (as in the pre-Robbins era). The regression of the Dearing Report on the University College title issue, it is suggested, is discriminatory (Scott, 1997) not only against

> '....*yesterday's ideal of a university, but also against what may be tomorrow's model of the distributed university – universities colleges (of both higher and further education) and other learning organisations linked in networks, both regional and global.'*
> (Scott, 1997: 2).

Scott further suggests that the Dearing Report failed to take account of the

> '....*dynamic relationship between further and higher education, its patterns of progression and pathways of opportunity that make a nonsense of the archaic apartheid that the Report feebly seeks to reinforce'*
> (ibid.).

The new binary line between the higher education and further education sectors, despite the cross-fertilisation and collaborative arrangements which exist, and in the face of predictions of the merger of funding systems (Duke, 1997), represents the threshold and most serious psychological barrier in the transformation from elite, through mass, into

universal higher education. The lifelong learning curriculum and the associated social, cultural, educational and economic aspirations cannot be contained within the university, or even what is currently regarded as the higher education, sector. The British system has historically been committed to the principle of social reproduction (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977) The process of creating open, accountable and democratic higher education will challenge those institutions to become agents of social transformation reforming a system which is based on elite, closed principles which have restricted not merely individual social mobility and aspiration but which continue to constrain institutional mobility through the status ranks of the higher education sector.

7.7 The Future Research Agenda

The preceding analysis has necessarily been bounded by a series of research questions and a set of methodological tools appropriate and relevant to the stated objectives. However, in the course of this study numerous issues have arisen which would form the basis of future research into aspects of education policy. First, the 'mapping' exercise which has been commenced in this study could be developed further on the basis of more rational definitional criteria than are currently available (or acceptable to various parts of the sector) and perhaps in a less politically charged atmosphere. Secondly, the impact of the policy conflict referred to in this study could be explored further in individual institutions in the University College sector enabling an examination to be undertaken on the basis of comparative data of the extent to which institutional history, context and aspiration are significant factors in determining the nature and vigour of the response to proposed

changes in title and status. Thirdly, there has not been the opportunity to examine the nature of changes to institutional title and status upon staff and students in the institutions referred to in study. Fourthly, there is considerable scope to analyse the nature of the student populations in the various institutions in the University College sector, since so many of these institutions claim a distinctive Mission (and to an extent, believe that their claim to University College status is thereby strengthened) in relation to access or religious denomination. These represent substantial research projects extending significantly beyond the scope of this study.

Notes

1. J.H. Newman's 'The Idea of the University' was originally published in 1853.

2. Halsey (1984) characterised the insecure base of many university institutions in the early years of the twentieth century thus:

> '....the redbrick universities, together with the dependencies of that large administrative and examining body which was London University, limped along from year to year in perennial anxiety about student admissions, fitful private philanthropy towards halls of residence and miniscule state support of research and library facilities. As an idea, however, they were essentially stationary.'
>
> (Halsey, 1984: 129)

3. Referring to the American model, Lynton and Elman (1987) argue that

> 'In spite of the considerable diversity among the universities ....the internal hierarchy of values, the measures of academic respectability, and the faculty reward and incentive systems are astonishingly-and distressingly-uniform'
>
> (Lynton and Elman, 1987: 11)

4. These are:
   Tradition *versus* Change
   Quality *versus* Quantity
   Excellence *versus* Equity
   Exclusion *versus* Inclusion and Access
   Research *versus* Teaching and Learning
   Pure knowledge (and 'cultural capital') *versus* Performativity (and 'human capital')
   Professional Control of the Curriculum *versus* Student-led provision
   'Donnish dominion' *versus* Managerialism
   Academic autonomy *versus* Accountability
   Objective and Critical Knowledge *versus* Relativism.

   (Jary and Parker, 1999: 4)

Appendix 1

The Classification and Designation of Further and Higher Education Institutions forming the University College Sector

Appendix 1: Table 1

Schools, Colleges and Institutes of the University of London permitted to award University of London degrees

The list forms part of Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54 The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997 which defines recognised bodies as '...universities, colleges or other bodies which are authorised by Royal Charter or by or under Act of Parliament to grant degrees and other bodies for the time being permitted by the aforementioned bodies to act on their behalf in the granting of degrees.' The list includes all institutions with independent degree-awarding powers, universities and higher education colleges.

This document includes a separate list of all Schools, Colleges and Institutes of the University of London which are deemed to be permitted by the University to award University of London degrees, as follows:

Birkbeck College (a)
Charing Cross and Westminster Medical School
Courtauld Institute of Art (b)
Goldsmiths College (a, b)
Heythrop College (b)
Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine (a,b)
Institute of Education (a)
Kings College, London (a,b)
London Business School (a)
London School of Economics and Political Science (a,b)
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (a)
Queen Mary and Westfield College (a,b)
† Royal Free Hospital School of Medicine (b)
Royal Holloway and Bedford New College (a,b)
Royal Postgraduate Medical School
Royal Veterinary College (b)
School of Advanced Study
School of Oriental and African Studies (a,b)
School of Pharmacy (a,b)
School of Slavonic and East European Studies (b)
St. George's Hospital Medical School (a,b)
† United Medical and Dental School of Guy's and St. Thomas' Hospitals
University College London (a,b)
Wye College (a,b)

Note 1: (a) refers to institutions separately funded by HEFCE
(b) refers to institutions with a separate entry in the UCAS Handbook
(a,b) refers to institutions which meet both criteria

Note 2:

† The Royal Free Hospital School of Medicine is funded as part of University College London although for admissions purposes has a separate UCAS listing and code.

> **(Source: HEFCE Recurrent Funding List 1998/99).**

† The United Medical and Dental School of Guy's and St. Thomas' Hospitals is now part of King's College London and the funding and admissions process is managed by the College.

> **(Source: UCAS Handbook 1999 Entry and HEFCE Recurrent Funding List 1998/99).**

> **(Source: Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 1 Education, England and Wales, Education, Scotland : The Education [Recognised Bodies] Order 1997; DfEE January).**

Appendix 1: Table 2

Institutions which are not Recognised Bodies within the 1988 Education Reform Act but which provide any course which is in preparation for a degree by a Recognised Body or are constituent colleges, schools or halls of a Recognised Body.

This table lists the name of each body which is not a recognised body within Section 214(2) (a) or (b) of the Education Reform Act 1988 but which either :

- provides any course which is in preparation for a degree to be granted by such a recognised body and is approved by or on behalf of that body: or

- is a constituent college, school, hall or other institution of a university which is such a recognised body.

Part II of the Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54 Education, England and Wales, Education, Scotland : The Education [Listed Bodies] Order 1997 lists eleven federal universities. Within the federal structure of these eleven universities there are one hundred and twenty-two constituent colleges, schools, halls or other institutions. Part II lists the constituent colleges, schools, halls or other institutions of Recognised Bodies, as defined.

Brunel University
Brunel University College

University of Cambridge
Christ's College (a)
Churchill College (a)
Clare College (a)
Clare Hall
Corpus Christi College (a)
Darwin College
Downing College (a)
Emmanuel College (a)
Fitzwilliam College (a)
Girton College (a)
Gonville and Caius College (a)
† Homerton College (a)
Hughes Hall (a)
Jesus College (a)
King's College (a)
Lucy Cavendish College (a)
Magdalene College (a)

New Hall (a)
Newnham College (a)
Pembroke College (a)
Peterhouse (a)
Queen's College (a)
Robinson College (a)
Selwyn College (a)
Sidney Sussex (a)
St. Catherine's College (a)
St Edmund's College (a)
St. John's College (a)
Trinity College (a)
Trinity Hall (a)
Wolfson College (a)

†   Homerton College is separate from the Faculty of Education of the University of Cambridge although deemed to be an Institution of the University of Cambridge as defined in this Schedule, is separately funded by HEFCE and described in the Recurrent Funding List as a Specialist Institution and, as in the case of all those institutions listed (a) above, has a separate UCAS code for admissions purposes.

University of Durham
College of St. Hild and St. Bede (a)
Collingwood College (a)
Graduate Society, The
Grey College (a)
Hatfield College (a)
St. Aidan's College (a)
St. Chad's College (a)
St. Cuthbert's College (a)
St. John's College (a)
St. Mary's College (a)
Trevelyan College (a)
University College (a)
University College, Stockton
Ushaw College
Van Mildert (a)

University of Kent at Canterbury
Darwin College
Eliot College
Keynes College
Rutherford College

University of Lancaster
Bowland College
Cartmel College
County College, The
Furness College
Fylde College
Graduate College, The
Grizedale College
Lonsdale College
Pendle College

University of London

Institutes of the University
British Institute in Paris (a)
University Marine Biological Station, Millport

Associate Institutions
Institute of Cancer Research
Jews' College (a)
Royal Academy of Music, The
Trinity College of Music

Other Institutions affiliated/associated with Colleges of the University
Eastman Dental Institute (University College London)
Institute of Neurology (University College London)
Institute of Psychiatry (King's College London)

Institutes which constitute the School of Advanced Study of the University
Institute of Advanced Legal Studies
Institute of Classical Studies
Institute of Commonwealth Studies
Institute of Germanic Studies
Institute of Historical Research
Institute of Latin American Studies
Institute of Romance Studies
Institute of United States Studies
Warburg Institute

University of Manchester
Manchester Business School

University of Oxford
All Souls College
Balliol College (a)
Brasenose College (a)

Christ Church (a)
Corpus Christi College (a)
Exeter College (a)
Green College
Harris Manchester College (a)
Hertford College (a)
Jesus College (a)
Keble College (a)
Kellogg College
Lady Margaret Hall (a)
Linacre College
Lincoln College (a)
Magdalen College (a)
Mansfield College (a)
Merton College (a)
New College (a)
Nuffield College
Oriel College (a)
Pembroke College (a)
Queen's College, The (a)
Somerville College (a)
St. Anne's College (a)
St. Anthony's College
St. Catherine's College (a)
St. Cross College
St. Edmund Hall (a)
St. Hilda's College (a)
St. Hugh's College (a)
St. John's College (a)
St. Peter's College (a)
Templeton College
Trinity College (a)
University College (a)
Wadham College (a)
Wolfson College
Worcester College (a)

Permanent Private Halls
Blackfriars College
Campion Hall
Greyfriars
Regent's Park College
St. Benet's Hall
Wycliffe Hall

University of St. Andrews
St. Leonard's College
St. Mary's College
United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard

University of Wales
University of Wales, Aberystwyth (a)
University of Wales, Cardiff (a)
University of Wales, Lampeter (a)
University College of North Wales (a)
University of Wales, Swansea (a)
University of Wales College of Medicine (a)
University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (a)
University of Wales College, Newport (a)

University of York
Alcuin College
Derwent College
Goodricke College
James College
Langwith College
Vanbrugh College
Wentworth College

Note: **(a) signifies those institutions to which students may make direct application through the UCAS system.**

Appendix 1: Table 3

Higher Education Institutions classified separately by the HEFCE as either General or Specialist Colleges

This table lists in alphabetical order all (58) higher education institutions classified by HEFCE separately from the university sector as either General Colleges or Specialist Institutions

Bath College of HE (c)
Bishop Grosseteste College (c)
Bolton Institute of Higher Education (d)
Bretton Hall (c)
Buckinghamshire College of HE (c)
Central School of Speech and Drama (b)
Canterbury Christ Church College (c)
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education (d)
Chester College of Higher Education (c)
Chichester Institute of Higher Education (d)
Cranfield University (a)
Cumbria College of Art and Design (b)
Dartington College of Arts (b)
Edge Hill College of Higher Education (c)
Falmouth College of Arts (b)
The College of Guidance Studies (d)
Harper Adams Agricultural College (c)
Homerton College, Cambridge (a)
Institute of Education (a)
Kent Institute of Art and Design (b)
King Alfred's College, Winchester (c)
Liverpool Hope College (c)
London Business School (a)
London School of Economics and Political Science (a)
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (a)
Nene College (c)
Newman College (d)
North Riding College (c)
Northern School of Contemporary Dance (b)
Norwich School of Art and Design (b)
Ravensbourne College (b)
Royal College of Nursing Institute (d)
College of Ripon and York St. John (c)
Roehampton Institute (d)
Rose Bruford College (b)

Royal Academy of Music (b)
Royal College of Art (b)
Royal College of Music (b)
Royal Northern College of Music (b)
Royal Veterinary College (a)
School of Oriental and African Studies (a)
School of Pharmacy (a)
St. George's Hospital Medical School (a)
College of St. Mark and St. John (c)
St. Martin's College (c)
St. Mary's College (c)
Southampton Institute (d)
Surrey Institute of Art and Design (b)
The London Institute (a)
Trinity and All Saints (c)
Trinity College of Music (b)
University of London (a)
Westhill College (d)
Westminster College, Oxford (d)
Wimbledon School of Art (b)
Worcester College of Higher Education (c)
Writtle College (c)
Wye College, University of London (a)

(a) **Institutions which are either university institutions or are part of a federal relationship (13)**
(b) **Institutions specialising in Arts education (Art , Design, Music, Dance, Drama) (16)**
(c) **Institutions employing the title University College (19)**
(d) **Institutions whose particular status is explained in the narrative (10)**

Appendix 1: Table 4

Further Education Institutions in Direct Receipt of HEFCE Funding for their Higher Education Work

This table lists alphabetically all (72) further education institutions in direct receipt of HEFCE funding for their higher education provision for 1998/99.

Askham Bryan College (b)
Bedford College (a)
Birmingham College (b)
Blackburn College (b)
Blackpool and Fylde College (b)
Bournemouth and Poole College of Art and Design (b)
Bracknell and Wokingham College (a)
Bradford and Ilkley Community College (b)
Brooklands Technical College (b)
Carlisle College (b)
Chesterfield College of Technology (b)
Chichester College of Arts, Science and Technology (a)
City College, Manchester (a)
City of Liverpool Community College (b)
Cleveland College of Art and Design (b)
Cordwainers College (b)
Coventry Technical College (b)
Crawley College of Technology (b)
Croydon College (b)
Dewsbury College (b)
Doncaster College (b)
Farnborough College of Technology (b)
Gloucestershire College of Art and Technology (a)
Guildford College of FHE (b)
Halton College of FE (b)
Hammersmith and W. London College (b)
Harlow College (a)
Havering College of FHE (a)
Henley College (b)
Herefordshire College of Art and Design (b)
Herefordshire College of Technology (b)
Highbury College, Portsmouth (a)
Lackham College (b)
Leeds College of Art and Design (b)
Loughborough College (a)
Mid-Kent College of HFE (b)

NE Worcestershire College (b)
New College Durham (b)
Newcastle College (a)
Newham College of Further Education (a)
North East Surrey College of Technology (b)
North Lincolnshire College (a)
Northbrook College, Sussex (a)
Northumberland College (a)
Oldham College of Technology (a)
Peterborough Regional College (b)
Reading College and School of Art and Design (b)
Rycotewood College (a)
Salisbury College (b)
Sandwell College of FHE (a)
Solihull College (b)
South Tyneside College of FE (a)
Southport College (b)
Sparsholt College, Hampshire (b)
St. Helens College (b)
Stephenson College (a)
Stockport College of FHE ((b)
Suffolk College of FHE (b)
Swindon College (b)
The College of North West London (b)
The Sheffield College (b)
Thurrock College (a)
Trowbridge College (b)
Wakefield College (b)
Walsall College of Technology (b)
Warrington Collegiate Institute (b)
West Thames College (b)
Westminster College, London (b)
Wigan and Leigh College (b)
Wirral Metropolitan College (b)
Worcestershire College of Technology (a)
York College of FHE (b)

Note: **(a)   refers to those institutions which make no reference to independent undergraduate provision or to a relationship with a parent university other than franchise agreements.**

(b)   refers to those institutions which explicitly refer to undergraduate programmes and a relationship with a parent university or higher education institution(s).   These various relationships are detailed in the main narrative.

Appendix 2

The Role of the Interview
In Establishing Validity
and Reliability

The Role of the Interview in establishing Validity and Reliability

A series of interviews has been conducted with senior managers (mainly Principals) from a range of non-university institutions within the University College sector with the aim of clarifying the current position and future role of the university colleges in the wider system of higher education and to explore the views of a number of key players on the outcomes of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Government's acceptance of its recommendations. These interviews were designed also to provide expert validation of the perceptions of the research problem, in effect to establish *jury validity* and *construct validity* and, in forming an alternative method of inquiry to documentary and policy analysis, to enable the triangulation of research findings. The research subjects were selected to take account of the range, nature and type of institutions which comprised the group of non-university higher education providers.

The schedule of interviews was as follows:

Dr. C. Carr	Principal, St. Martin's University College, Lancaster. 29 April, 1998.
Dr. J. Cater	Principal, Edge Hill University College. 31 March 1998.
Dr. M. Coughlan	Principal (Designate), Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds. 24 March, 1998.
Professor S. Lee	Rector and Chief Executive, Liverpool Hope University College. 1 April, 1998.
Dr. D. Timms	Assistant Principal, Bath Spa University College 28 April, 1998.

Dr. G. Turnbull   Principal, Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds. 24 March, 1998.

The format adopted was that of the semi-structured interview, whose outline form and content (see below) was disclosed to the research participants at least one week in advance of the interview in order to allow time for reflection on the issues (and, indeed, to allow the participants, having examined the proposed content, nature, purpose and approach of the interview to withdraw from the schedule, if they so wished).

There are numerous methodological, practical and ethical issues surrounding the interview as a research instrument. There are many forms of interview requiring different approaches to design and techniques of implementation. The structure of individual interviews varies according to aim, for example, whether they seek factual information, opinions, attitudes, or narratives and life histories (Kvale, 1996). Broadly, there are four types of interview utilised in social research: *structured*, which relies predominantly upon the questionnaire as the data collection instrument and is based upon a uniform structure enabling direct comparability and aggregation of responses; *semi-structured*, which combines a formal structure of questioning but which allows the interviewer to probe in search of clarification and elaboration; *group*, which allow the interviewer to focus upon group norms and dynamics in the interview situation; and *unstructured*, which is open-ended in character and which emphasises the interviewee's frame of reference, sense of meaning and interpretation, for example in oral history (May, 1993).

In this study, having regard both to the nature of the inquiry into the perceptions of key players of the political developments in the higher education sector, and the nature of the subjects as influential figures in these developments, the semi-structured interview was considered to be the most appropriate since it would provide an enabling framework to allow the respondents to elaborate upon the issues from their own perspective, thus providing valuable insight into the research questions.   From the researcher's perspective the semi-structured approach also provided a limiting device to prevent the subject from digressing into less relevant commentary.   Kvale (1996) identifies seven stages of interview investigation: thematizing; designing; interviewing; transcribing; analysing; verifying; and reporting.   This classification provides a means of identifying in this context the various methodological, practical and ethical issues which have arisen at each of these stages.

Thematizing refers to the conceptual clarification of the research question and the formulation of research questions - essentially the 'operationalisation' of the research topic. Having analysed the political developments leading to the establishment of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, the status of university colleges and their future role as providers of higher education was challenged.   The interviews sought to elicit from senior staff in selected institutions representative of the broad spectrum of (non-university) university colleges their view of the position of their own institution, their interpretation of current developments across the sector, the perceived need for structural reform, the political context in which the reforms were proposed, and the likely outcomes for their own institutions and the sector.

In the *design* of the interview stage, the limitations upon time and resources required a range of institutions to be selected to represent the institutions in the University College sector. This sample of College Principals and Chief Executives was based upon the classification of institutions taking account of sector (e.g. Church Colleges, HEI, FEI); status (e.g. taught degree-awarding powers); size; geographical location (to reflect the importance of catchment as a justification for independence); and relationship with parent universities. These research subjects and institutional characteristics were selected to assess the degree of consistency of response the changes proposed from a range of organisations represented in the 'map' of the (non-university) University College sector sector which is developed in Chapter 5 of the study.

The *interview* process began with the important consideration of the issue of access to key players at senior levels in the organisations concerned (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994). In this respect, as a senior manager in higher education, the researcher had maintained previous regular professional contact with the subjects and this considerably facilitated access. This professional relationship was clearly distinguished from the role of researcher from the outset, although numerous respondents affirmed that they were prepared to speak more freely and more readily accept assurances of confidentiality because of previous professional contact. It was clear that this professional context and history affected the researcher-subject role, largely to the benefit of the research outcomes, in that the research participants recognised the level of seniority, expertise and knowledge of the researcher and avoided many of the complex issues relating to relative status in interviewing powerful subjects (Walford, 1994). This factor also minimised the potential

problems arising from the power relationship between the researcher and subject which, for example, may prevent the researcher pursuing sensitive lines of inquiry(Mishler, 1986) and lessened the impact of the location of the interviews which were always conducted on the subjects' territory, a factor which can affect the researcher-subject relationship in terms of providing a secure environment for the subject leading to a greater level of co-operation and responsiveness (Ozga and Gewirtz, 1994).

The meetings were prefaced by the submission of a written outline of the semi-structured interview one week in advance in order to allow the respondent to consider and prepare their approach to the issues. This also served to reassure the respondents of the clear and genuine focus of the research.

The interviews were recorded using, at various times, note-taking and audiotape recording. Initially, note-taking was the preferred method since this form of recording, it was believed, would least disrupt the dynamic of the interview and, in view of the potential sensitivity of the material, would reinforce the confidentiality of the proceedings for the respondents. However, this form of recording did not allow the nuance of tone, for example, sarcasm or disbelief, to be recorded or remembered accurately. Furthermore, the researcher's attention was constantly distracted from the subject to the note-pad which prevented a clear interpretation of the body language of the respondent and jeopardised the crucial rapport with the respondent. Despite the potential intrusiveness of recording equipment (Borg and Gall, 1989), the technical pitfalls (Kvale, 1996), and the unnecessary burden of full transcription, since this research is not centrally dependent on

content analysis, it was decided that audiotape recording would be more effective in that it reduced the tendency of the interviewer to make an unconscious selection of responses favouring his biases (Brenner, 1985), provided the opportunity to repeat and re-analyse the interview where accuracy of interpretation could be reaffirmed, and improved the speed and continuity of the interview process.

The interviews recorded by means of audiotape were transcribed into written text and the subjects were assured that the material (particularly where utilised as direct quotations) would be verified with the respondent. It is also important to recognise that full transcription does not necessarily afford the level of objectivity implied. Transcribing involves the translation from an oral language to a written language each with different sets of rules. Rather than copies of some original reality, transcripts are interpretive constructions which are useful tools for specific purposes, decontextualised and detemporalised (Kvale, 1996). However, in this study, the value of the interviews and their significance was derived from the views expressed in the context of the wider policy issues rather than upon close content analysis of the manner in which those views were expressed.

The method of *analysis* of the outcomes of the interview process was considered at the design stage since it is essential to determine the method of data analysis prior to data collection. It was evident from the outset that, given the nature of the subject matter, the subjects selected and the different forms of expression of opinion on politically sensitive matters which they were likely to adopt, interpretation rather than analysis was the most

productive approach. This required the researcher to participate in the interview. Recognising the problems of researcher bias and the 'response effect' (Borg, 1981) which in part relates to the tendency of the researcher to seek out the responses that support his or her preconceived notions, the exploration of the tentative hypothesis connecting structural reform in higher education to institutional status required the researcher to engage the respondent in a debate about the issues, not all of which were evident to the subjects. To that extent, the interviews were used as a means of exploring how these key players interpreted the politics of structural reform in higher education, and equally importantly, examined how, as leaders of higher education institutions, they assessed the impact of the proposed changes within their own context.

Issues relating to the *verification* of the interview findings and the *reporting* of the outcomes of the study, particularly as they relate to the ethical issues in the conduct of research are considered in the main body of the chapter on Research Methods (Chapter 2).

Nonetheless, reliability tests can be applied with varying degrees of value to all aspects of method whether quantitative studies, observational techniques, or textual analysis. The consistency of research findings in qualitative investigation affect this study in several ways.

First, interviewer reliability is an important feature and particularly concerns the issue of leading questions in the interview. It has long been recognised that the particular wording of a question may influence the response (Loftus and Palmer, 1974), although leading

questions may often be a necessary element of the interview process, for example to obtain information which the researcher suspects is being withheld. Leading questions may also be a valuable means of repeatedly checking the reliability of the subjects' responses and therefore may, in fact enhance the reliability of the research findings. Kvale observes that the attention focused on leading questions may stem from a naive empiricism based on a belief in the neutral observational access to an objective social reality through the research interview in which the researcher collects, rather than constructs, responses (Kvale,1996).

Secondly, issues of (validity and) reliability arise in the transcription of interviews in which

> *'Different transcripts are constructions of different worlds, each designed to fit our particular theoretical assumptions and to allow us to explore their implications'*
>
> (Mishler, 1991: 271).

The inherent differences between an oral and written mode of discourse compound the technical difficulties associated with the act of transcription, for example the interpretation of pauses, repetitions, or the interpretation of tone of voice, level of anxiety or humour. Verbatim descriptions are necessary for linguistic analysis but do not reflect the conversational context with its flow of meaning and the spatial, temporal and social dimensions of the interview. This is the essence of transcription and the researcher's role.

Thirdly, in the control of the analysis, certain types of research studies are amenable to the use of multiple interviewers with correlation of the output data to ensure intersubjective

agreement.   In this study, the interviews were highly individualised commentaries, prompted by a series of questions and comments by the researcher, about a set of national political developments in which the observations were personal and contextualised.   In this instance, the interaction between the researcher and the subject constructed the outcomes.   To this extent, the involvement in, and the interpretation of the responses in the interview situation by the researcher were based on the researcher's background knowledge of the issues and judgements as to the appropriate response to the subjects' comments on those issues.   Therefore, the explication of procedures (which is a further means of assuring reliability) to enable the analysis of the interview material to be 'retraced' would, nonetheless, produce a different analysis, since it would be decontextualised and based on different perceptions, both of the issues and of the researcher-subject relationship.   In this instance, therefore, neither the use of multiple interviewers nor the explication of procedures for secondary analysis were considered necessary or productive.

The Interview Format

A Framework for Discussion on the Use of University College Title

1   The Institution

When did the institution adopt the title university college?

On what grounds did the institution adopt the title?

Was its adoption encouraged/endorsed/prompted by your parent university ?

What was the relationship with the parent university at the time - accredited; validated; federated?

Has the relationship changed since the adoption of the title?

Does your Mission differ significantly from that of your parent university ? If so, how?

Does the recruitment profile differ significantly from that of the parent university in providing a particular
    local/regional dimension to recruitment
    high intake of mature students
    access policies
    vocationalism (course profile)

Has the curriculum of your institution changed fundamentally since the adoption of the title university college ?

What does the use of the university college title mean to the success of your institution ?

The Context

How have you viewed the CVCP position on this issue? Does your parent university subscribe to it?

What is your view of the SCOP position during the debate? Has SCOP assisted your cause?

In your view which group was most influential on this issue during the consultation process?

In your view what factors determined the outcomes of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education on the issue of university college title?

The Consultation

In the institution's submission to Dearing did you make specific reference made to the university college issue? What was the logic of your position ?

Why do you think the issue of university college title arose in the first instance?

Did you consult with your parent university on your respective submissions to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education particularly on the university college title issue ?

Do you believe that your parent university supported your case in the wider debate?

The Recommendations

Do you believe the position on university college title adopted by the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education and the Government support for it to be justified?

Do you think the distinction that National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education highlighted between titles and names has some basis?

What is the view of your parent university with regard to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education's recommendations on the university college title issue?

3   The Current Position

What is your view of the Government's response on the university college title issue?

Is it justifiable for institutions to continue to use the university college title without legal authority as defined in the Report?

Do you think that the cause of those institutions with justifiable claim to the use of the title university college has been damaged by its adoption by a number of institutions on the basis more of aspiration than legitimacy?

Do you think that the case of your own institution is 'special' ?

Do you see a case for 'special pleading' from a small number of institutions in particular circumstances ?

Do you think the debate remains open ? Is there a possibility that the strength of opinion in the College sector will cause a change of Government stance on the issue?

Have you been involved in any sector-wide debate about this issue? Is there a collective view which has emerged or any agreement on concerted action?

What action has the institution taken on the university college title issue between the publication of the Dearing Report in June 1997 and the Government response in February 1998 ?

4   The Future

What impact will the loss of university college title have on your ability to deliver your organisational mission?

What are the marketing implications for your institution of losing the university college title?

Do you anticipate damage to your recruitment capacity ?

What is your immediate and medium-term strategy on the title issue?

How is the future relationship with your parent university likely to develop in these circumstances?

Are the options identified in Dearing (i.e. DAP; federated status; integration) available to you?

Are there options available to you which are not available to other institutions ?

5   The Wider Implications

What do you think is the main message from these developments for the future structure of higher education ?

What is your view of the distinction between higher education colleges and further education colleges in that generic category of non-university providers of higher education?

Is the distinction meaningful/valuable/necessary/important/logical ? Why?

In your view is the position which the government has taken on the university college title issue likely to have any effect on its ability to deliver the agenda of access and widening participation as set out in 'The Learning Age' ?

M. Rhodes
March 1998

Bibliography

Adelman, G., Jenkins, D., and Kemmis, S. (1984)
'Rethinking case study', in J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey, and S. Goulding (eds.) (1984) *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management._*London: Harper and Row.

Allington, N.F.B. and O'Shaughnessy, N.J. (1989)
Funding and Management of Higher Education. London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

Allington, N.F.B. and O'Shaughnessy, N.J. (1992)
Light, Liberty and Learning: the idea of a university revisited. Surrey: Warlinghem.

Aldcroft, D.H. (1982)
'Britain's Economic Decline', in G.W.Roderick and M.D. Stephens (eds.) (1992) *The British Malaise: Industrial Performance, Education and Training in Britain Today.* Lewes: Falmer.

Allan, C. (1992)
'Widening participation in higher education'. *Journal of Access Studies* Vol. 7 (1), 33-41.

Anderson, C. W. (1993)
Prescribing the Life of the Mind: an essay on the purpose of the University, the aims of Liberal education, the competence of citizens, and the cultivation of practical reason. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Anderson, R.D. (1992)
Universities and Elites in Britain since 1800. Hampshire: Macmillan.

Anderson, D.S. and Biddle, B.J. (eds.) (1991)
Knowledge for Policy. London: Falmer.

Annan, N.G.A. (1990)
Our Age: the genertion that made post-war Britain. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Anon. (1998)
The Lesson of Lesley. London: Parliamentary Brief. Vol. 5 No.5, May.

Armytage, W.H.G. (1955)
Civic Universities : an aspect of a British Tradition. London: Ernest Benn.

Association for Part-time Higher Education. (1996)   'Re-engineering higher education to meet the needs of part-time students', *Newsletter* No. 16, December. Manchester: APHE.

Association of Colleges. (1996)   *Higher Education in a Learning Society : A response from the Association of Colleges.* September. London: unpublished.

Association of Colleges. (1997)   *National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* Transcript of the Evidence Session of the Association of Colleges. 12 February. London: unpublished.

Bailey, K.D. (1978)   *Methods of Social Research.* London: Collier-Macmillan.

Bain, W. (1995)   'The Loss of Innocence: Lyotard, Foucault, and the challenge of postmodern education' in M. Peters (ed.) (1995) *Education and the Postmodern Condition.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Baird, J. R. (1988)   'Quality: what should make higher education *higher*'. *Higher Education Research and Development* Vol. 7 (2), 141-152.

Ball, C., Sir (1990)   *More Means Different.* London: Royal Society of Arts.

Ball, C., Sir and Eggins, H. (eds.) (1989)   *Higher Education into the 1990s: new dimensions.* Buckinghamshire: SRHE/Open University Press.

Ball. S. J. (1990)   *Politics and Policy Making in Education.* London: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (1993)   'Education Markets, Choice and Social Class'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* Vol. 14 (1), 3-19.

Bell, R.E. and A.J. Youngson (1973)   *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

Bamford, T.W. (1978)   *The University of Hull : The First Fifty Years.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barnett, R. (1985)   'Higher Education: legitimation crisis'. *Studies in Higher Education* Vol. 10 (3), 241-255.

Barnett, R. (1993) *The Idea of Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Barnett, R. (1995) 'Universities for a Learning Society', in F. Coffield (ed.) *Higher Education in a Learning Society.* Durham: University of Durham, School of Education.

Barnett, R. (1997a) 'Beyond Competence', in F. Coffield and B. Williamson *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Barnett, R. (1997b) 'A Knowledge Strategy for Universities', in R. Barnett and A. Griffin (eds.) *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education.* London: Cassell.

Barnett, R. and Griffin, A. (1997) *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education.* London: Cassell.

Bauman, Z. (1997) 'Universities : Old, New and Different', in A. Smith and F. Webster (eds.) (1997) *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society.* Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Beare, H. and Slaughter, R. (1993) *Education for the Twenty-First Century.*   London: Routledge.

Becher, T. and Kogan, M. (1992) *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* London: Routledge.

Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society: towards a new modernity.* London: Sage.

Bell, J. (1987) *Doing Your Own Research Project.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bell, J., Bush, T., Fox, A., Goodey, J., and Goulding, S. (eds.) (1984) *Conducting Small-Scale Investigations in Educational Management.*   London: Harper and Row.

Bell, R.E. (1973) 'The growth of the modern university', in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson (1973) *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London, Tavistock.

Bell, R.E. and Youngson, A.J. (1973)   *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

Beloff, M. (1968)   *The Plateglass Universities.* London: Secker and Warburg.

Beloff, M. (1973)   'Universities and the enemies of excellence', in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson (1973) *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

Benn, R. and Fieldhouse, R. (1993)   'Government policies on university expansion and wider access', *Studies in Higher Education.* Vol. 18 (3), 299-313.

Berdahl, R. (1959)   *British Universities and the State.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Berdahl, R., Moodie, G., and Spitzberg, I. (1991)   *Quality and Access in Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Bereday, G.Z. (1973)   *Universities For All.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berg, B. L. (1989)   *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences.* Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Berger, P.L. and Luckman, T. (1966)   *The Social Construction of Reality.* New York: Doubleday.

Bettenson, E.M. (1971)   *The University of Newcastle upon Tyne : A Historical Introduction.* Newcastle upon Tyne: University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Birch, W. (1988)   *The Challenge to Higher Education: reconciling responsibilities to scholarship and to society.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Bird, R. (1994)   'Reflections on the British Government and Higher Education in the 1980s.' *Higher Education Quarterly,* Vol. 48 (April), 73-85.

Bjarnason, S. and Barnett, R. (1996)   *Colleges and Institutes of Higher Education. HEQC Reports: A Review and Analysis.* University of London: Institute of Education.

Blackburn, R.M. and   'Changing inequalities in access to British universities.'
Jarman, J. (1993)   *Oxford Review of Higher Education.* Vol. 19 (2), 197-215.

Blackstone, T. (1991)   'Access, Quality and Governance: One Institution's Struggle
for Progress', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1991) *The Future of
Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University
Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Bogdan, R. and Biklen, S.   *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to
(1982)   Theory and Methods.* Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Booth, C. (1987)   'Central Government and Higher Education Planning 1965-
1986' *Higher Education Quarterly.* Vol. 41 (1), 57-72.

Bordieu, P. and Passeron,   *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* London:
J-C. (1977)   Sage.

Borg, W.R. (1981)   *Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide for
Teachers.* New York: Longman.

Borg, W.R. and Gall, M.D.   *Educational Research.* New York: Longman.
(1989)

Bradshaw, D. (1992)   'Other Colleges', in I. McNay (ed.) (1992) *Vision of Post-
Compulsory Education.* Buckingham: Open University
Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Brenner, M. (1985)   'Intensive Interviewing', in M. Brenner, J. Brown and D.
Canter *The Research Interview: uses and approaches.*
London: Academic Press.

Brenner, M., Brown, J. and   *The Research Interview: uses and approaches.* London:
Canter, D. (1985)   Academic Press.

Brickman, W.W. (1982)   *Educational Historiography: Tradition, Theory and
Technique.* Cherry Hill, New Jersey: Emeritus, Inc.

British Educational   *Ethical Guidelines.* London: British Educational Research
Research Assocation.   Association.
(1989)

British Psychological   *Ethical Principles for Research with Human Subjects.*
Society. (1978)   London: British Psychological Society.

British Sociological
Association. (1992)
Statement of Ethical Practices. Durham: British
Sociological Asociation.

Brosan, G., Carter, C.,
Layard, R., Venables, P.,
and Williams, G. (1971)
Patterns and Policies in Higher Education.
Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Brown, P. (1995)
'Cultural capital and social exclusion ; some observations on
recent rends in education, employment and the labour
market.' *Work, Employment and Society,* Vol. 9 (1), 29-51.

Brown, P. (1996)
'Education, Globalisation and Economic Development'
Education Policy, Vol. 1.(1), 1-25.

Brown, P. and Scase, R.
(1994)
*Higher Education and Corporate Realities : Class, Culture
and the Decline of Graduate Careers.* London: University
College London Press.

Bryman, A. (1988)
Quantity and Quality in Social Research. London: Unwin
Hyman.

Bryman, A. and Burgess,
R.G. (1994)
Analysing Qualitative Data London: Routledge.

Bulmer, M. (1982)
Social Research Ethics. London: Macmillan.

Burgess, R.G. (ed.)
(1985a)
Strategies of Educational Research: Qualitative Methods .
London: Falmer.

Burgess, R.G. (1985b)
Field Methods in the Study of Education. Lewes: Falmer
Press.

Burgess, R.G. (ed.) (1989)
The Ethics of Educational Research. Lewes: Falmer
Press.

Burns, C.D. (1924)
A Short History of Birkbeck College. London: University of
London.

Burrell, G. and Morgan, G.
(1979)
Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis.
London: Heinemann.

Burstyn, J.N. (1987)
'History as Image: Changing the Lens', *History of Education
Quarterly,* Vol. 27 (2), 167-180.

Campbell, D. and Stanley, J. (1963)	'Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching.', in N. Gage (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally.
Caine, S. Sir (1963)	*The History of the Foundation of the London School of Economics and Political Science.* London: Bell.
Caine, S. Sir, (1969)	*British Universities: Purpose and Prospects.* London: The Bodley Head.
Cant, R.G. (1970)	*The University of St. Andrews : a short history.* Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
Cantor, L.M. and Matthews, G.F. (1977)	*Loughborough: From College to University A history of higher education at Loughborough.* Loughborough: Loughborough University of Technology.
Carr, E.H. (1967)	*What is History?* New York: Random House.
Carswell, J. (1985)	*Government and the Universities in Britain.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Carswell, J.(1988)	'What Robbins took for granted', *Oxford Review of Education,* Vol. 14 (1) 21-32.
Carter, C.F. (1980)	*Higher Education for the Future.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Carter, C., Sir. (1980)	'Not enough higher education and too many universities?', in N. Evans (ed.) (1980) *Education Beyond School: Higher Education for a Changing Context.* London: MacIntyre.
Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, Department for Education and Formation (1996)	*Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* November: London.
Cave, M., Dodsworth, R. and Thompson, D. (1992)	'Regulatory Reform in Higher Education in the UK.' *Oxford Review of Economic Policy,* Vol. 8 (2) 79-102.
Chapman, A.W. (1955)	*The Story of a Modern University : The History of the University of Sheffield.* Sheffield: Cumberlege.
Childs, W. M. (1933)	*Making a University : An Account of the University Movement at Reading.* London: Dent.

Clark, B.R. (1983)   *The Higher Education System: Academic Organisation in Cross-National Perspective.*   California: University of California Press.

Clark, S. (1995)   'Access and admissions: current bottlenecks.' *Journal of Access Studies* Vol. 10 (2), 137-155.

Clapp, B.W. (1982)   *The University of Exeter: A History.*   Exeter: The University of Exeter.

Coffield, F. (ed.) (1995)   *Higher Education in a Learning Society.*   Durham: University of Durham School of Education *for* the Department for Education and Employment/ Economic and Social Research Council/ Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Coffield, F. and Vignoles, A.(1997)   *Widening Participation in higher education by ethnic minorities, women and alternative students.*   Supplementary Report 5. The National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. London: HMSO.

Coffield, F. and Williamson, B. (eds.) (1997a)   *Repositioning Higher Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Coffield, F. and Williamson, B. (eds.) (1997b)   'The Challenges Facing Higher Education', in F.Coffield and B. Williamson (eds.) (1997) *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1994)   *Research Methods in Education.* (Fourth edition). London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K.R.B. (forthcoming)   *Research methods in Education.* (Fifth edition). London: Routledge.

Commission on Higher Education. (1967)   *Presentation and Summary Report.*   Dublin: Government Publications.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1991)   *The State of the Universities.* London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

| Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1995) | *Report of a Meeting with the Secretary of State for Education and Employment.* N/95/159, August. London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. |

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1995) — *Report of a Meeting with the Secretary of State for Education and Employment.* N/95/159, August. London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1996) — *Our Universities, Our Future.* CVCP Evidence to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education, November. London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1997a) — 'Universities and Colleges welcome report of vision and realism.' *Media Release. London:* Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, 23 July.

Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. (1997b) — *CVCP Working Party on University College Title: Final Report.* February: unpublished.

Confederation of British Industry. (1994) — *Thinking Ahead : Ensuring the Expansion of Higher Education into the 21st Century.* London: Confederation of British Industries.

Cottle, B. (1951) — *The Life of a University.* Bristol: University of Bristol.

Council for Industry and Higher Education. (1987) — *Towards a Partnership.* London: Council for Industry and Higher Education.

Council of Anglican Principals. (1996) — *Submission to the Dearing Committee Review of Higher Education.* November. Canterbury: unpublished

Council of Church and Associated Colleges. (1996) — *Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* October. Southampton: unpublished.

Council of Validating Universities (1996) — *Code of Practice.* Bristol: University of the West of England.

Croft, S. and Beresford, P. (1992) — 'The Politics of Participation.' *Critical Social Policy.* Vol. 35, 20-144.

Crosland, A. (1965) — Speech by the Secretary of State for Education and Science at Woolwich Polytechnic. 27 April, 1965, in J. Pratt (1997) *The Polytechnic Experiment.* Buckingham, Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Daiches, D. (ed.) (1964)   *The Idea of a New University : An experiment in Sussex.*
                                London: Deutsch.

Davies, P., Williams. J. nd   Access to Higher Education in the late Twentieth Century:
Webb, S. (1997)   Policy, Power and Discourse', in J. Williams (ed.) (1997)
                                *Negotiating Access to Higher Education: The Discourse of
                                Selectivity and Equity.*   Buckingham: Open University
                                Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Dearing, R. Sir (1997)   *Higher Education in the Learning Society.* Report of the
                                National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.
                                London, HMSO.

De Ridder-Symoens, H.   *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 1 Universities in
(1992)   the Middle Ages.*   Cambridge: Cambridge University
                                Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1970)   *The Research Act in Sociology: A Theoretical Introduction
                                to Sociological Methods.* London: Butterworth.

Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln,   *Handbook of Qualitative Research.*   Thousand Oaks CA:
Y.S. (eds.) (1994)   Sage.

Department for Education.   Student Numbers in Higher Education - Great Britain 1980-
(1993)   81 to 1990-91. *Statistical Bulletin 17-93.* London: DfE.

Department for Education   *Lifetime Learning ; A Consultation Document.*   London:
and Employment. (1995)   HMSO.

Department for Education   *Statement to the House of Commons by the Secretary of
and Employment. (1996a)   State.* 19 February. London: Hansard.

Department for Education   *A position paper by the DfEE, the Scottish Office, the Welsh
and Employment. (1996b)   Office and the Department of Education for Northern
                                Ireland. submitted to the National Committee of Inquiry into
                                Higher Education.* June 1996. London: DfEE.

Department for Education   *Government Response to the Dearing Committee Report on
and Employment. (1997a)   Higher Education.* Press Release 226/97, 23 July.

Department for Education   *Higher Education for the 21st Century.* London: DfEE.
and Employment. (1997b)

Department for Education and Employment. (1997c)	*Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 1. Education, England and Wales. Education, Scotland. The Education (Recognised Bodies) Order 1997.* DfEE. London: HMSO.
Department for Education and Employment. (1997d)	*Statutory Instrument 1997 No. 54. Education, England and Wales. Education, Scotland. The Education (Listed Bodies) Order 1997.* DfEE. London: HMSO.
Department for Education and Employment. (1998)	*The Learning Age.* London: HMSO.
Department of Education and Science. (1978)	*Report of the Working Group on the Management of Higher Education in the Maintained Sector.* (Oakes Report) London: HMSO.
Department of Education and Science. (1982)	*Higher Education in England outside the Universities: Policy, Funding and Management.* A Consultative Document. London: HMSO.
Department of Education and Science. (1985)	*The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s.* Cmnd. 9524. London: HMSO.
Department of Education and Science. (1986)	*Projections of Demand for Higher Education in Great Britain 1986-2000.* London: Department of Education and Science.
Department of Education and Science. (1987)	*Higher Education: Meeting the Challenge.* Cmnd. 114. London: HMSO.
Department of Education and Science. (1991)	*Higher Education; A New Framework.* Cmnd. 1541. London HMSO.
Department of Trade and Industry. (1994)	*Competitiveness: Helping Business to Win.* Cmnd. 2563 London: HMSO.
Department of Trade and Industry. (1995)	*Competitiveness: Forging Ahead.* Cmnd. 2867. London: HMSO.
Department of Trade and Industry. (1996)	*Competitiveness: Creating the Enterprise Centre of Europe.* Cmnd. 3330. London: HMSO.
Diener, E. and Crandall, R. (1978)	*Ethics in Social and Behavioural Research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Donaldson, L. (1975)   *Policy and the Polytechnics : pluralistic drift in higher education.*   Hampshire: Saxon House.

Donmoyer, R. (1990)   'Generalisability and the single case-study', in A.W. Eisner and A. Peshkin (eds.) *Qualitative Inquiry in Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Duke, C. (1989)   Creating the Accessible Institution' in O. Fulton (ed.) (1989) *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Duke, C. (1992)   *The Learning University: towards a new paradigm?* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Duke, C. (1997)   'Towards a Lifelong Curriculum', in F. Coffield and B. Williamson (eds.) (1997) *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Duncan, G.M. (1968)   *A Dictionary of Sociology.*   London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Edson, C.H. (1986)   'Our past and present: historical inquiry in education', *The Journal of Thought.* Vol.21 (3), 13-27.

Eggins, H. (ed.) (1988)   *Restructuring Higher Education.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Eisner, E.W. and Peshkin, A. (1991)   *Qualitative Inquiry in Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Esland, G. (ed.) (1991)   *Education, Training and Employment Vol.1: Educated labour – the changing basis of industrial demand.* Wokingham: Addison-Wesley/Open University Press.

Eustace, R.B. (1994)   'University autonomy; the 80s and after' *Higher Education Quarterly* Vol. 48 (2), 87-117.

Evans, N. (ed.) (1980)   *Education Beyond School: Higher Education for a Changing Context.* London: Grant McIntyre.

Fay, B. (1975) *Social Theory and Political Practice.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Fiddes, E. (1937) *Chapters in the History of Owens College and of Manchester University 1851-1914.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Finch, J. (1986) *Research and Policy.* Lewes: Falmer.

Finch, J. (1993) 'It's Great to have Someone to Talk to: Ethics and Politics of Interviewing Women', in M. Hammersley (ed.) (1993) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice.* London: Sage.

Finch, J. and
Rustin, M. (1986) *A Degree of Choice? Higher Education and the Right to Learn.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Finegold, D. and Soskice, D. (1991) 'The Failure of Training in Britain: Analysis and Prescription. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy.* Vol. 4 (3), 21-53.

Finegold, D., Miliband, D., Robertson, D., Ziman,J., Keep,E. and Sisson, K. (1992) *Higher Education : Expansion and Reform.*   London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Flint, C. (1991) 'The Future and Further Education', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1991) *The Future of Higher Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Fowler, G.T. (1982) 'May a Thousand Flowers Bloom.' *New Universities Quarterly.* Vol. 32 (2), 122-144.

Fowler, G.T. (1988) 'Long-term effects of financial reductions in higher education the polytechnics in England and Wales'. *International Journal of Institutional Management in Higher Education.* Vol.12 (1), 92-103.

Fryer, R.H. (1997) *Learning for the Twenty-First Century.*   First Report of the National Advisory Group for Continuing Education and Lifelong Learning. London: DfEE.

Fuller, T. (ed.) (1989) *The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oakeshott on Education.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fulton, O. (ed.) (1989)   *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Fulton, O. and Ellwood, S. (1989)   'Admissions, Access and Institutional Change', in O. Fulton (ed.) (1989) *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Further Education Funding Council. (1996)   *The FEFC's response to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.*   Coventry: Further Education Funding Council. November.

Further Education Funding Council. (1997)   *The FEFC's response to the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.*   Coventry: Further Education Funding Council. October.

Gage, N. (ed.) (1963)   *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gallie, W.B. (1960)   *A New University ; A.D. Lindsay and the Keele Experiment* London: Chatto and Windus.

Gaskell, M. (1997)   *Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* Unpublished letter to Baroness Blackstone, Minister for Higher Education. 4 August.

Gellert, C. (1993)   'Structural and Functional Differentiation: Remarks on Changing Paradigms of Tertiary Education in Europe', in C. Gellert (ed.) (1993) *Higher Education in Europe* London: Jessica Kingsley.

Gibbons, M., Limoges,C., Nowotny, H., Schwarzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994)   *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies.* London: Sage.

Giddens, A. (ed.) (1975)   *Positivism and Sociology.*   London: Heinemann.

Giddens, A. (ed.) (1976)   *New Rules of Sociological Method: A Positive Critique of Interpretive Sociologies.* London: Hutchinson.

Glaser, B. G. and Strauss, A. L. (1967)   *The Discovery of Grounded Theory : Strategies for Qualitative Research.* New York: Aldine.

Goetz, J.P. and LeCompte, M. D. (1984) — *Ethnogrphy and Qualitative Design in Education Research.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gosden, P. and Taylor, A.J. (1975) — *Studies in the History of a University 1874-1974: to commemorate the centenary of the University of Leeds.* Leeds: Arnoldson.

Grant, N. (1973) — 'Structure of higher education: some international comparisons' in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson (1973) *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

Grave, W.W. (1983) — *Fitzwilliam College Cambridge 1869-1969: Its history as the Non-Collegiate Institution of the University and its Beginnings as an Independent College.* Cambridge: The Fitzwilliam Society.

Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1982) — *Effective Evaluation: Improving the Usefulness of Evaluation Results through Responsive and Naturalistic Approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Habermas, J. (1989) — *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures.* Cambridge MA: Massachussetts Institute of Technology.

Hague, D. Sir, (1991) — *Beyond Universities: A New Republic of the Intellect.* London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

Hale Bellot, H. (1929) — *University College London 1826-1926.* London: University of London Press.

Halpin, D. and Troyna, B (1994) — *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues.* London: The Falmer Press.

Halsey, A.H. (1972) — 'Are the British Universities Capable of Change.' *New Universities Quarterly.* Vol. 33 (4), 402-416.

Halsey, A.H. (1985) — 'The Idea of a University: the Charles Carter Lecture, 1984.' *Oxford Review of Education.* Vol. 11 (2), 115-132.

Halsey, A.H. (1992a) — *The Decline of Donnish Dominion.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Halsey, A.H. (1992b) — *Opening Wide the Doors of Education.* London: National Commission on Education: Briefing Paper No. 6.

Halsey, A.H. (1995)	'Dons' Decline Reviewed' in F. Coffield (ed.) (1995) *Higher Education in a Learning Society*. Durham: University of Durham, School of Education.

Hammersley, M. (ed.) (1992)	*Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.

Hammersley, M. (1993)	*Educational Research*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. (1983)	*Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. London:Tavistock.

Handy, C.B. and Aitken, R. (1986)	*Understanding Schools as Organisations*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Harding, G. and Kington, B. (1989)	'Industry and Higher Education: a Strategy for Partnership', in Sir C. Ball and H. Eggins (eds.) (1989) *Higher Education into the 1990s: new dimensions*. Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Harris, M. (1997)	*The Vice-Chancellor's Response on behalf of the University of Manchester to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education*. September. University of Manchester: unpublished.

Harvey, L. (1990)	*Critical Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Henwood, K.L. and Pidgeon, N.F. (1992)	'Qualitative Research and Psychological Theorizing' in M. Hammersley (1992) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1995)	*Higher Education in Further Education Colleges: Funding the Relationship*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1996a)	*Higher Education in Further Education Colleges: A Future Funding Approach*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England .

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1996b)	*Funding Method for Teaching from 1998-99*. Circular 21/96 Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1996c)

Submission by the Higher Education Funding Council for England to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. November. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England .

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1997)

Response by the Higher Education Funding Council for England to the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. October. Bristol: unpublished.

Higher Education Funding Council for England. (1999)

Recurrent Funding Lists 1998/99. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England.

Higher Education Quality Council. (1996)

Graduate Standards Programme: threshold and other academic standards. London: Higher Education Quality Council.

Higher Education Statistics Agency. (1998)

Higher Education Statistics for the United Kingdom 1996/9. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency.

Higher Education Statistics Agency. (1999)

Higher Education Management Statistics – Sector Level 1996/9. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency.

Hillman, J. (1996)

University for Industry: creating a national learning network.' London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Hinkson, J. (1995)

'Lyotard, postmodernity and education: a critical evaluation', in M. Peters (ed.) (1995) *Education and the Postmodern Condition.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Holt, J. C. (1977)

The University of Reading: the first fifty years. Reading: Reading University Press.

Homan, R. (1991)

The Ethics of Social Research. London: Longman.

Huelin, G. (1978)

King's College London 1828-1978. London: University of London, King's College.

Hughes, C. and Tight, M. (1995)

'The myth of the learning society'. *British Journal of Educational Studies.* Vol. XXXXIII (3), 290-304.

Hutton, W. (1995)

The State We're In. London: Jonathan Cape.

Jarrett, A. Sir (1985)   *Report of the Steering Committee for Efficiency Studies in Universities.* London: Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

Jary, D. and Parker, M (eds.) (1999)   *The New Higher Education: issues and Directions for the Post-Dearing University.* Stoke-on-Trent: Staffordshire University Press.

Jenkins, S. (1995)   *Accountable to None* London: Hamish Hamilton.

Jensen, K.B. (1989)   'Discourses of interviewing: validating qualitative research findings through textual analysis', in S. Kvale (ed.) (1996) *Issues of Validity in Qualitative Research.* Lund: Sweden, Studentlitteratur.

Johnes, J. (1992)   'The potential effects of wider access to higher education on degree quality' *Higher Education Quarterly.* Vol. 46 (1), 88-107.

Jones, D.R. (1988)   *The Origins of Civic Universities: Manchester, Leeds and Liverpool.* London: Routledge.

Jones, G. and Quinn, M. (1983)   *Fountains of Praise: University College Cardiff 1883-1983.* Cardiff: University College Cardiff Press.

Kearney, H. (1973)   'Universities and society in historical perspective', in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson (1973) *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

Keep, E. (1995)   'The Economic Demand for Higher Education, and Investing in People - Two Aspects of Sustainable Development in British Higher Education', in F. Coffield (ed.) (1995) *Higher Education in a Learning Society.* Durham: University of Durham, School of Education.

Keep, E. (1995)   'Economic Demand for Higher Education.' *Higher Education Quarterly.* Vol. 50 (2), 89-109.

Keep, E. And Mayhew, K. (1995)   'Training policy for competitiveness - time for a fresh perspective', in H. Metcalfe (ed.) (1995) *Future Skill Demand and Supply.* London: Policy Studies Institute.

Kennedy, H. (1997)   *Learning Works: Widening Participation in Further Education.* Coventry: Further Education Funding Council.

Kennedy, M. M. (1979)

'Generalising from single case-studies'. *Evaluation Quarterly*, Vol. 3, 661-678.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1991)

'Science and behavioural research', in D.S. Anderson and B.J. Biddle (eds.) (1991) *Knowledge for Policy*. London: Falmer.

Kogan, M. and Kogan, D. (1983)

The Attack on Higher Education. London: Kogan Page.

Kolakowski, L. (1992)

'An overall view of Positivism' in M. Hammersley (ed.) (1992) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice*. London: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1989)

Issues of Validity in Qualitative Research. Lund: Sweden, Studentlitteratur.

Kvale, S. (1996)

Interviews. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lal, D. (1989)

Nationalised Universities: Paradox of the Privatisation Age. London: Centre for Policy Studies.

Lasch, C. (1995)

The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy. New York: W.W. Norton.

Layard, R., King, J. and Moser, C. (1969)

The Impact of Robbins. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

LeCompte, M. D. and Preissle, J. (1993)

Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research (Second edition). London: Academic Press Ltd.

Lee, S. (1996)

Faith in Higher Education : Liverpool Hope University College Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. November. Liverpool Hope University College: unpublished.

Lee, S. (1997)

Taking Faith in Higher Education Seriously: The Response of Liverpool Hope University College to the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. October. Liverpool Hope University College: unpublished.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1990)

'Towards a categorical imperative for qualitative research', in E.W. Eisner and A. Peshkin (eds.) (1991) *Qualitative Inquiry in Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. (1985)   *Naturalistic Inquiry.*   Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Local Government Association. (1997)   *Response to the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.*   October. London: unpublished.

Locke, M., Pratt, J. and Burgess, T. (1985)   *The Colleges of Higher Education 1972 to 1982 : the central management of organic change.* Croydon: Critical Press.

Loftus, E.L. and Palmer, J.C. (1974)   'Reconstruction of automobile destruction: an example of the interaction between language and memory.' *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour.* Vol. 13, 585-589.

Lowe, J. (1973)   'The other side of the binary system', in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London, Tavistock.

Lynton, E.A. and Elman, S. E. (1987)   *New Priorities for the University.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lyotard, J.F. (1984)   *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacDonald, B. And Walker. R. (1974)   'Innovation, evaluation, research and the problem of control - some interim papers.' *SAFARI Project.* Centre for Applied Research in Education: University of East Anglia.

Macdowell, R. B. (1952)   *Trinity College Dublin 1592-1952.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mackay, L., Scott, P. and Smith, D. (1995)   'Restructured and Differentiated? Institutional Responses to the Changing Environment of UK Higher Education.' *Higher Education Management.* Vol. 7 (2), 193-205.

Mackie, J. D. (1954)   *The University of Glasgow 1451-1951 : a short history.* Glasgow: Jackson, Son and Company.

MacQueen, J.G. and Taylor, S.W. (eds.) (1976)   *University and Community Essays to mark the Centenary of the founding of University College, Bristol.*   Bristol: University of Bristol.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (1989)   *Designing Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Martin, G. (1990)

From Vision to Reality : the making of the University of Kent at Canterbury. Canterbury: University of Kent.

Marwick, A. (1970)

The Nature of History. London: Macmillan.

Massors, N. (1998)

Student Markets. Warrington Collegiate Institute: A Survey of the first year intake of full-time degree students for 1997/98. Warrington Collegiate Institute: unpublished research project.

Mauch, J. and Sabloff (eds.) (1995)

Reform and Change in Higher Education: International Perspectives. New York: Garland.

Maxwell, J. (1992)

'Understanding and validity in qualitative research', *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 62 (3), 279-300.

May, T. (1993)

Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994)

Beginning Qualitative Research. London: Falmer.

McDowell, R.B. and Webb, D.A.(1982)

Trinity College Dublin 1592-1952 ; an academic history. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGregor, G.P. (1991)

A Church College for the 21st century? 150 years of Ripon and York St. John. York: Sessions.

McKinlay, R. A. (1991)

The University Of Bradford : Origins and Development. Bradford: Bradford University Press.

McLaughlin, T.H. (1992)

'Citizenship, Diversity and Education: a philosophical perspective'. *Journal of Moral Education.* Vol. 21 (3) 235-250.

McNair, S. (1997)

'Is There a Crisis? Does It Matter?', in R. Barnett and A. Griffin (eds.) (1997) *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education.* London: Cassell.

McNay, I. (1992)

'Access: Growth, Outreach and Openness', in I. McNay (ed.) (1992) *Vision of Post-Compulsory Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

McNay, I. (1992)   'The 1980s: Change, Contradiction, Confusion and their Legacy', in I. McNay (ed.) (1992) *Visions of Post-Compulsory Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

McNay, I. (ed.) (1992)   *Visions of Post-Compulsory Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

McNay, I. (1995)   'From Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Culture of Universities', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1995) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

McPherson, A. (1991)   'Widening the Access Argument', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1991) *The Future of Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Mead, G.H. (ed.) (1934)   *Mind, Self and Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Metcalfe, H. (1995)   *Future Skill Demand and Supply.* London: Policy Studies Institute.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1984)   *Qualitative Data Analysis.* Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Miliband, D. (1992)   'Introduction: Expansion and Reform' in D. Finegold, D. Miliband, D. Robertson, J. Ziman, E. Keep. and K. Sisson. *Higher Education: Expansion and Reform.* London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Mills, C.W. (1970)   *The Sociological Imagination.* Harmondsworth: Penguin (originally published in 1959 by Oxford University Press).

Minogue, K. R. (1973)   *The Concept of a University.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Mishler, E.G. (1986)   *Research Interviewing - Context and Narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mishler, E.G. (1990) 'Validation in inquiry-guided research: the role of exemplars in narrative studies.' *Harvard Educational Review.* Vol. 60 (4), 415-442.

Mishler, E.G. (1991) 'Representing discourse: the rhetoric of transcription' *Journal of Narrative and Life History.* Vol. 1 255-280

Moberly, W., Sir. (1949) *The Crisis in the University.* London: SCM Press.

Morgan, I. (1928) *The College By The Sea : a record and a review.* Aberystwyth: University College, Wales.

Morris, C. (1963) 'First Reactions to the Robbins Report'. *Universities Quarterly,* Vol. 18 (1963-64), 9-16.

Morse, E. J. (1992) 'English Civic Universities and the Myth of Decline', in L. Brockliss *History of Universities Vol. 11.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moser, C. (1988) 'The Robbins Report - 25 Years After.' *Oxford Review of Education.* Vol. 14 (1) 5-20.

Mouly, G.J. (1978) *Educational Research: The Art and Science of Investigation.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Muller, D.K., Ringer, F. and Simon, B. (eds.) (1987) *The Rise of the Modern Secondary School: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, J. (1993) 'A Degree of Waste : the economic benefits of educational expansion.' *Oxford Review of Education.* Vol. 19 (1), 9-31.

Murphy, J.A. (1995) *The College: A History of Queen's University College Cork, (1845-1995).* University College Cork: Cork University Press.

Murphy, J., John, M and Brown, H. (eds.) (1984) *Dialogues and Debates in Social Psychology.* Buckingham: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates in association with the Open University Press.

National Commission on Education. (1994) *Universities in the Twenty-First Century: A Lecture Series.* London: National Commission on Education.

Neave, G. (1985) 'Elite and mass higher education in Britain: a regressive model?', *Comparative Education Review.* Vol. 29 (3), 347-361.

Newman, J.H. (1976)   *The Idea of a University.* (ed. I.T. Ker). Oxford: Oxford University Press (originally published in 1853).

Niblett, W.R., Humphreys, D.W., and Fairhurst, J.R. (1975)   *The University Connection.* Berkshire: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Noble, D.D. (1994)   'Let Them Eat Skills' *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies,* Vol. 16 (1), 15-29.

Noblit, G. W. and Hare, R.D. (1988)   *Meta-Ethnography: Synthesising Qualitative Studies.* Beverley Hills, CA, Sage.

O'Reilly, S., and Rowan,A. (1990)   *University College Dublin.*   The Irish Heritage Series 68. Dublin: Eason and Son.

Orne, M.T. (1962)   'On the social psychology of the psychological experiment: with particular reference to demand characteristics'. *American Psychologist,* Vol. 17, 776-783.

Ozga, J. and Gewirtz, S (1994)   'Sex, Lies and Audiotape: Interviewing the Education Policy Elite', in D. Halpin and B. Troyna (1994) *Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues.* London: The Falmer Press.

Palous, R. (1995)   'The Social and Political Vocation of the University in the Global Age', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1995) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Parry, G. (1986)   'From patronage to partnership', *Journal of Access Studies.* Vol.1 (1), 43-53.

Parry, G. (1989)   'Marketing and mediating the Higher-Education Boundary', in O. Fulton (ed.) (1989) *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..

Parry, G. (1996)   'Access education in England and Wales 1973-1994 from second chance to third wave', *Journal of Access Studies.* Vol. 11 (1), 10-33.

Parry, G. And Wake, C. (eds.) (1990)   *Access and Alternative Futures.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Patton, M. Q. (1990) *Qualitative Education Methods.* Beverley Hills, CA: Sage. Second edition.

Pemberton, J. and *The University College at Buckingham: A first account of its*
Pemberton, J. (1979) *conception, foundation and early years.* Buckingham: Buckingham Press.

Perkin, H.J. (1969) *New Universities in the United Kingdom.* Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Peters, M. (1995) *Education and the Postmodern Condition.* Westport, Connecticut: Bergin and Garvey.

Platt, J. (1981) 'Evidence and proof in documentary research'. *Sociological Review,* Vol. 29 (1), 31-52.

Popper, K. R. (1980) *The Logic of Scientific Discovery.* Fourth edition. London: Hutchinson..

Potter, J. and Wetherall, M. 'Analysing Discourse' in A. Bryman and R.G. Burgess (eds)
(1994) *Analysing Qualitative Data.* London: Routledge.

Pratt, J. (1997) *The Polytechnic Experiment.* Buckingham, Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Price, D.T.W. (1990) *A History of St. David's University College Lampeter Volume Two: 1898-1971.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Principals of the Catholic *Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into*
Higher Education Colleges. *Higher Education.* November. London: unpublished.
(1996)

Punch, M. (1986) *The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork.* California: Sage.

Quality Support *'What they said to Dearing': A review of a selection of*
Centre/Committee of Vice- *submissions to the National Committee of Inquiry into*
Chancellors and Principals. *Higher Education.* Milton Keynes: The Open University.
(1997)

Ranson, S. and *Management for the Public Domain.* New York: St.
Stewart, J. (1994) Martin's Press.

Reason, P. (1994) *Participation in Human Inquiry.* London: Sage.

Reason, P. and Rowan, J. (eds.) (1981)   *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research.* Chichester: John Wiley and Son.

Reeves, M. (1988)   *The Crisis in Higher Education: competence, delight and common good.* Buckinghamshire: SRHE/Open University Press.

Reid, E. (1991)   'Access and Institutional Change', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1991) *The Future of Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Rex, J. (ed.) (1974)   *Approaches to Sociology: An Introduction to Major Trends in British Sociology.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rhodes, M. (1996)   *Inter-institutional collaboration.* Independent Supervised Study. Doctorate in Education Programme. November. University of Durham: unpublished.

Rhodes, M. (1997)   *University College Title.* A Confidential Discussion Paper submitted to the University of Manchester. September, unpublished.

Robbins, The Lord (1963)   *Higher Education Report.* Cmnd.2154. London: HMSO.

Robbins, The Lord (1966)   *The University in the Modern World.* London: Macmillan.

Robbins, L. Baron (1981)   *Higher Education Revisited.* London: Macmillan.

Robertson, C.G. (1944)   *The British Universities.* London: Methuen.

Robertson, D. (1993)   'Establishing strategic direction in higher education institutions.' *Public Money and Management,* Vol. 11 (3), 45-51.

Robertson, D. (1995)   'The reform of higher education: for social equity, individual choice and mobility', in F. Coffield (ed.) (1995) *Higher Education in a Learning Society.* Durham: University of Durham, School of Education.

Robertson, D. (1997a)   'A Hot Potato, A Lightning Conductor and A Short Straw.' *Parliamentary Brief,* Vol. 5 (2), 7-10.

Robertson, D. (1997b)   'Social Justice in a Learning Market', in F. Coffield and B. Williamson (eds.) (1997) *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Robertson, D. (1998)   'Who won the war of Dearing's ear?'. *Higher Education Review,* Vol. 30 (2) 7-22.

Robertson, D. (1999)   'The Dearing Inquiry as Process – Delegated Thinking and the Limits of Expert Advice.' *Higher Education Quarterly* Vol. 53 (2), 116-140.

Robertson, D. and Hillman,   'Widening Participation in Higher Education by Students
J. (1997)   from Lower Socio-Economic Groups and Students with Disabilities.' *Report No. 6 of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* London: HMSO.

Roderick, G.W. and   'The British Education System 1870-1970', in
Stephens, M.D. (1982)   G.W.Roderick and M.D. Stephens (eds.) *The British Malaise: Industrial Performance, Education and Training in Britain Today.* Lewes: Falmer.

Robinson, E. (1968)   *The New Polytechnics: A Radical Policy for Higher Education.* London: Cornmarket.

Runciman. W.G. (ed.)   *Weber Selections in Translation.* Cambridge: Cambridge
(1978)   University Press.

Salner, M. (1989)   'Validity in human science research', in S. Kvale (ed.) (1989) *Issues of Validity in Qualitative Research.* Lund: Sweden, Studentlitteratur.

Salter, B. And   *The State and Higher Education.* Essex: The Woburn Press.
Tapper, B. (1994)

Sanderson, M. (1972)   *The Universities and British Industry 1850-1970.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schofield, J. W. (1993)   'Increasing the generalisability of qualitative research', in M. Hammersley (ed.) (1993) *Educational Research.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd..

Schuller, T. (1991)   'Reassessing the Future', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1991) *The Future of Higher Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Schuller, T. (ed.) (1991)   *The Future of Higher Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Schuller, T. (1992)   'The exploding community? The university idea and the smashing of the academic atom', in I. McNay (ed.) (1992) *Vision of Post-Compulsory Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Schuller, T. (1995)   'The Changing University? A Sketchmap with Coda', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1995) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

Schuller, T. (ed.) (1995)   *The Changing University?* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Scott, P. (1984)   *The Crisis of the University.*   London: Croom Helm.

Scott, P. (1988)   'Blueprint or Blue Remembered Hills.' *Oxford Review of Education.* Vol. 14 (1), 33-48.

Scott, P. (1989)   'The Power of Ideas', in Sir C. Ball and H. Eggins (eds.) (1989) *Higher Education into the 1990s: new dimensions.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Scott, P. (1991)   'Access: An Overview', in T. Schuller (1991) *The Future of Higher Education.*   Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Scott, P. (1993)   'The idea of the university in the 21st century.' *British Journal of Education Studies.* Vol. 41 (1), 4-25.

Scott, P. (1995a)   *The Meanings of Mass Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Scott, P. (1995b)	'University – State relations in Britain: Paradigm of Autonomy' in J.E. Mauch and P.L.W. Sabloff (1995) *Reform and Change in Higher Education: International Perspectives.* New York: Garland.
Scott, P. (1997a)	'The Crisis of Knowledge and the Massification of Higher Education', in R. Barnett and A. Griffin (eds.) (1997) *The End of Knowledge in Higher Education.* London: Cassell.
Scott, P. (1997b)	'View from here'. *The Independent.* 13 November.
Scott, P. (1997c)	'The Implications of the Deaing Report for the Academic Profession.' *The Dearing Report: Commentaries and Highlights.* Special Digest Supplement. London: Open University Quality Support Centre.
Scott, P. (1997d)	The Postmodern University?', in A. Smith and F. Webster (eds.) (1997) *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society.* Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..
Serafini, A. (ed.) (1989)	*Ethics and Social Concerns.* New York: Paragon House.
Shackleton, J. (1995)	'The View from Further Education', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1995) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.
Shattock, M. (1984)	*The UGC and the Management of British Universities.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.
Shattock, M. (1991)	*Making a University : a celebration of Warwick's first twenty-five years.* Warwick: University of Warwick.
Shattock, M. (1995)	'The University of the Future'. *Higher Education Management.* July 1995, Vol.7 (2), 157-164.
Shattock,M. (ed.) (1996)	*The Creation of a University System.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Sherborne, J.W. (1976)	'The College and the Community : University College Bristol 1876-1909', in J.G. MacQueen and S.W.Taylor (eds) (1976) *University and Community: essays to mark the centenary of University College Bristol.* Bristol: The University of Bristol.

Shils, E. (1962)   'Observations on the American University', in M. Shattock (ed.) (1996) *The Creation of a University System.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Silver, H. (1980)   'Enforced conformity or hierarchical diversity.', in N. Evans (ed.) (1980) *Education Beyond School: Higher Education for a Changing Context.* London: MacIntyre.

Silverman, D. (1985)   *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology.* Aldershot, Hants.: Gower.

Simon, E. (1946)   'The Universities and the Government'. *Universities Quarterly,* Vol. 1 (1946-47), 79-95.

Slee, P. (1989)   'A consensus framework for higher education', in Sir C. Ball and H. Eggins (eds.) (1989) *Higher Education into the 1990s: new dimensions.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Smith, H. W. (1975)   *Strategies of Social Research: The Methodological Imagination.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smith, N.D., Scott, P. and Mackay, L. (1993)   'Mission Impossible? Access and the Dash to Growth in British Higher Education. *Higher Education Quarterly.* Vol.47 (4), 317-333.

Smith, A. and Webster, F. (eds.) (1997)   *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society.* Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Smithers, A. and Robinson, P. (1996)   *Trends in Higher Education.* London: Council for Industry and Higher Education.

Smithers, A. and Robinson, P. (1989)   *Increasing Participation in Higher Education.* Manchester: University of Manchester and BP Education.

Staff and Educational Development Association. (1996)   *Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education.* November. Birmingham: Staff and Educational Development Association.

Stake, R.E. (1978)   'The case study method in social inquiry', *Educational Researcher,* Vol. 7 (February), 5-8.

Stake, R.E. (1994)
'Case studies', in N.K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) (1994) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1996)
'Quality and Diversity': Submission to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. November. London, Standing Conference of Principals: unpublished.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1997a)
Preliminary Analysis of the Recommendations of the Dearing Report 'Higher Education in a Learning Society. July. Standing Conference of Principals. London: unpublished.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1997b)
Response of the Standing Conference of Principals to the Report of the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education. October. Standing Conference of Principals. London: unpublished.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1997c)
Annual Report and Accounts for the period 1 August 1996 to 31 July 1997. November. Standing Conference of Principals. London: unpublished.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1997d)
DfEE Post-Dearing Meeting. Notes of Executive Secretary of a meeting held on 27 November 1997 between DfEE and SCOP officials. December. Standing Conference of Principals: unpublished.

Standing Conference of Principals. (1997e)
Dearing, the DfEE, CVCP and University College Title. A Briefing Paper prepared for a meeting with DfEE. November. Standing Conference of Principals: unpublished.

Stewart, W.A.C. (1989)
Higher Education in Postwar Britain. London: Macmillan.

Stone, W.G. (1964)
'Steps leading to the Foundation of the University' in D. Daiches (ed.) (1964) *The Idea of a New University: An experiment in Sussex.* London: Deutsch.

Sutherland, S. (1994)
'The Idea of a University?' *Universities in the 21st Century.* London: National Commission on Education.

Tapper, F. and Salter, B. (1992)
Oxford, Cambridge and the Changing Idea of the University: the Challenge to Donnish Domination. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Tapper, F. and Salter, B. (1998)	'The Dearing Report and the Maintenance of Academic Standards: Towards a New Academic Corporatism.' *Higher Education Quarterly*. Vol. 52 (1), 22-34.
Tasker, M. and Packham, D. (1993)	'Industry and higher education : a question of values' *Studies in Higher Education* Vol. 18 (2), 127-136.
Tasker, M. and Packham, D. (1993)	Changing Cultures? Government intervention in Higher Education 1987-93. *British Journal of Education Studies*. Vol. 42 (2), 150-162.
Taylor, R. (1996)	'Preserving the Liberal Tradition in 'New Times' in J. Wallis (ed.) (1996) *Liberal Adult Education: the end of an era?* University of Nottingham: Continuing Education Press.
The Association of Graduate Recruiters. (1993)	*Roles for Graduates in the Twenty-First Century : getting the balance right.* Cambridge: Association of Graduate Recruiters.
The Association of Graduate Recruiters. (1995)	*Skills for Graduates in the 21st Century.* Cambridge: Association of Graduate Recruiters.
The World Bank. (1994)	*Higher Education : The Lessons of Experience.* Washington: The World Bank.
Thompson, A. (1997)	Gatekeeping: Inclusionary and Exclusionary Discourses and Practices', in J. Williams (ed.) (1997) *Negotiating Access to Higher Education: The Discourse of Selectivity and Equity.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education..
Thompson, A. and Goddard, A. (1999)	'Elite Trumped in Access Stakes'. *Times Higher Education Supplment.* 5 March.
Thompson, J. (1886)	*The Owens College : Its Foundation and Growth and its Connection with the Victoria University, Manchester.* Manchester: J. E. Cornish.
Tight, M. (1988)	'Institutional Typologies'. *Higher Education Review.* Vol. 20 (3), 27-51.

Tight, M. (1989)   'The Ideology of Higher Education', in O. Fulton (ed.) (1989) *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Topping, J. (1981)   *The Beginnings of Brunel University: From Technical College to University.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Trow, M. (1964)   'Robbins: A Question of Size and Shape.' *Universities Quarterly,* Vol. 18 (1963-64), 136-152.

Trow, M. (1974)   'Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education'. *Policies for Higher Education.* General Report on the Conferences on Future Structures of Post-Secondary Education. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Trow, M. (1987)   'Academic Standards and Mass Higher Education.' *Higher Education Quarterly,* Vol. 41 (Summer), 268-292.

Trow, M. (1989)   'The Robbins Trap': British attitudes and the limits of expansion. *Higher Education Quarterly,* Vol. 43 (1), 55-75.

Trow, M. (1991)   'Comparative perspectives on policy' in R. Berdahl, G. Moodie and I. Spitzberg (eds.) (1991) *Quality and Access in Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Trow, M. (1998)   'The Dearing Report: A Transatlantic View.' *Higher Education Quarterly.* Vol. 52 (1), 93-117.

Tuckett, A. (1990)   'A Higher Education System Fit For Adult Learners', in G. Parry and C. Wake (1990) *Access and Alternative Futures for Higher Education.* Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.

Universities and Colleges Admissions Service. (1998)   *UCAS Handbook: Entry 1999.* Cheltenham: UCAS.

University Grants Committee. (1984)   *A Strategy for Higher Education into the 1990s.* London: HMSO.

University of Manchester. (1973)   *The Victoria University of Manchester Supplemental Charter.* Granted by Letters Patent, 12 February, 1973.

University of Manchester. (1993)

Manchester, University of Manchester.
An Agreement between the University of Manchester and Warrington Collegiate Institute. Manchester, University of Manchester.

University of Manchester. (1996)

University Colleges: Criteria. Internal Paper prepared for the meeting of the Joint Committee on University Colleges. University of Manchester, 10/96/3: 8 October, 1996.

University of Manchester. (1998)

Calendar 1998/99. Manchester: University of Manchester.

Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1996)

'Liberal Adult Education and the Postmodern Movement', in J. Wallis (ed.) (1996) *Liberal Adult Education: the end of an era?* University of Nottingham: Continuing Education Press.

Vaizey, J. (1973)

'Planning of higher education in the seventies', in R.E. Bell and A.J. Youngson (1973) *Present and Future in Higher Education.* London: Tavistock.

van Vught, F.A. and Neave, G. (1991)

Prometheus Bound: the changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe. Oxford: Pergamon.

Venables, P. (1965)

'Dualism in Higher Education' *Universities Quarterly,* Vol. 20 (1965-66), 16-29.

Venables, P. (1978)

Higher Education Developments : The Technological Universities 1956-1976. London: Faber and Faber.

von Wright, G.H. (1992)

'Two Traditions', in M. Hammersley (ed.) (1992) *Social Research: Philosophy, Politics and Practice.* London: Sage.

Wagner, L. (1989)

'National Policy and Institutional Development', in O. Fulton (ed.) (1989) *Access and Institutional Change.* Buckingham: Open University Press/SRHE.

Wagner, L. (1995)

'A Thirty-Year Perspective: From the Sixties to the Nineties', in T. Schuller (ed.) (1995) *The Changing University?* Buckingham: SRHE/ Open University Press.

Walford, G. (1987)

Restructuring Universities: Politics and Power in the Management of Change. London: Croom Helm.

Walford, G. (1988)   'The privatisation of British higher education.' *European Journal of Education*. Vol. 23 (1/2), 47-64.

Walford, G. (1991)   'Changing Relationship between Government and Higher Education in Britain' in F.A. van Vught and G. Neave *Prometheus Bound: the changing relationship between government and higher education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Walford, G. (1994)   *Researching the Powerful in Education*. London: University College Press.

Wallis, J. (1996)   *Liberal Adult Education: the end of an era?'* University of Nottingham: Continuing Education Press.

Warrington Collegiate Institute (1995)   *Response to the Higher Education Funding Council for England on Higher Education in Further Education 'Funding the Relationship'*. March. Warrington Collegiate Institute: unpublished.

Warrington Collegiate Institute (1996a)   *Response to the Report on 'Higher Education in Further Education Colleges: A Future Funding Approach*. March. Warrington Collegiate Institute: unpublished.

Warrington Collegiate Institute (1996b)   *Response to the National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education*. November. Warrington Collegiate Institute: unpublished.

Warrington Collegiate Institute (1998)   *University College : Context and Position*. An internal paper. July. Warrington Collegiate Institute: unpublished.

Watson, D. and Taylor, R. (1998)   *Lifelong Learning and the University : A Post-Dearing Agenda*. London: Falmer.

Watts, A.G. (1972)   *Diversity and Choice in Higher Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Weale, M. (1992)   'The benefits of higher education : a comparison of universities and polytechnics.' *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 8 (2), 35-47.

Williams, G. and Blackstone, T. (1983)   *Response to Adversity: higher education in a harsh climate*. Guildford: Society for Research into Higher Education.

Williams, G. and Fry, H. (1994)

Longer Term prospects for British Higher Education. A Report to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals. London: Institute of Education.

Williams, J. (1997)

'Institutional Rhetorics and Realities', in J. Williams (ed.) (1997) *Negotiating Access to Higher Education: The Discourse of Selectivity and Equity.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Williams, J. (1997)

'The Discourse of Access: The Legitimation of Selectivity', in J. Williams (ed.) (1997) *Negotiating Access to Higher Education: The Discourse of Selectivity and Equity.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Williams, J. (ed.) (1997)

Negotiating Access to Higher Education: The Discourse of Selectivity and Equity. Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Williams, J. G. (1993)

The University Movement in Wales. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Williamson, B. And Coffield, F. (1997)

'Repositioning Higher Education', in F. Coffield and B. Williamson (eds.) (1997) *Repositioning Higher Education.* Buckingham: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Wilson, K. (1989)

'The pattern, range and purpose of higher education: a moral perspective', in Sir C. Ball and H. Eggins (eds.) (1989) *Higher Education into the 1990s: new dimensions.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Wilson, R.A. (1995)

'Future Employment Prospects for the Highly Qualified', in F. Coffield (ed.) (1995) *Higher Education in a Learning Society.* Durham: University of Durham, School of Education.

Wood, A.C. (1953)

A History of University College Nottingham 1881-1948. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wright, P. G. W. (1988)   'Rethinking the aims of higher education', in H. Eggins (ed.) (1988) *Restructuring Higher Education.* Buckinghamshire: Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Wright, P. (1991)   'Access or Accessibility?', *Journal of Access Studies.* Vol. 6 (1), 6-15.

Yin, R. (1989)   *Case Study Research.* London: Sage.

Zimbardo, P. C. (1984)   'On the ethics of intervention in human psychological research with specific reference to the Stanford Prison Experiment', in J. Murphy, M. John and H. Brown (eds.) (1984) *Dialogues and Debates in Social Psychology.* Buckingham: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates in association with the Open University Press.

Zuckerman, S. (1958)   'The Growth of Higher Education', *Universities Quarterly.* Vol. 12 (1958), 241-248.