

# Beyond TQM

LEE HARVEY

Centre for Research into Quality, University of Central England in Birmingham, Birmingham  
B42 2TP, UK

**ABSTRACT** *The variety of TQM approaches are briefly explored and some core elements specified. The application of TQM to the higher education context is examined. The 'generic' problems of TQM are analysed along with the particular problems of attempting to relate it to higher education. The analysis is not intended to merely demolish a fragile model of TQM but to show that there are aspects of TQM that are portable to a collegiate setting while illustrating the inapplicability of a TQM approach in higher education. Collegialism is reassessed in the light of the 'lessons' of TQM and a new collegiate model is outlined.*

## Introduction

Debates about the applicability of TQM to higher education have been raging for at least five years without making any headway. Polemic, assertion, rumour and prejudice have been the hallmarks of these debates. At one pole are the converts who hear, see and speak no evil of TQM. They consist of managers looking for a quick fix, consultants looking for a quick buck and educationalists who sincerely see in TQM a chance to emulate the quality success found in some industrial and commercial settings. At the other pole are equally committed educationalists who argue that an industrial model of quality assurance is philosophically at variance with the higher educational enterprise. They are supported by academics fearful of managerialism [1] who see an erosion of autonomy as the inevitable outcome of any concession to TQM and by cynics who assert the impracticality of any kind of total approach in a higher education setting.

The debate is repetitive, tedious and sterile and it is time to go *beyond* TQM. Rather than debate suitability it is time to look at practice and determine the worthwhile aspects of TQM and relocate them in the higher education context, stripped of alienating managerialist jargon and linked firmly to existing quality processes.

The paper will attempt to identify, briefly, the variety of TQM approaches, specify some core elements, and explore the way TQM is applied in the higher education context. This will be followed by an analysis of the 'generic' problems of TQM and the particular problems in attempting to relate it to higher education. In criticising the application of TQM in higher education, the critic is always at risk of creating a 'straw model', from the plethora of TQM approaches, that does no justice to any particular variant. No doubt, such an accusation could be levelled at this analysis. However, the point of the analysis is not to demolish a fragile model of TQM but to show that there are aspects of TQM that are portable to a collegiate setting while illustrating the inapplicability of a TQM approach in higher education. Collegialism is reassessed in the light of the 'lessons' of TQM and a new collegiate model is outlined.

### TQM Variations

Harari (1993) estimates that there are almost a thousand versions of TQM and that it has become a billion-dollar industry in its own right. Although there are numerous versions, the key differences between TQM approaches are the relative emphases given to:

- the use of statistical procedures;
- reflecting customers wants or needs;
- anticipating customer desires;
- and fitness for purpose or consistency.

For example, exponents of TQM influenced by Crosby aim for a fault-free supply or service that conforms to specified standards, the benefits of which offset the costs (Ingle, 1985; Halpin, 1966). 'TQM is concerned chiefly with changing attitudes and skills so that the culture of the organisation becomes one of preventing failure and the norm is operating right first time' (Oakland, 1990, p. 8). For those influenced by Deming the emphasis is on fitting or exceeding customer expectations and using statistics to measure performance in all areas with a view to reducing variability by continuous, incremental improvement (Scherkenbach, 1986; Gitlow & Gitlow, 1987). Juran and his followers emphasise a fitness-for-purpose approach, which sets team goals on a project-by-project basis and warns against: campaigns to do perfect work, 'tool-driven' approaches and assuming that quality is free (Juran & Gryna, 1980).

Each 'quality guru' puts a different slant on what is an essentially pragmatic and prescriptive process. TQM has no theoretical or epistemological underpinning—it is pragmatic.

No particular approach to TQM is significantly better than any other in industry according to a review by a non-profit research company called GOAL/TQC who compared six different variants of TQM, all of which worked (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 88).

### Generic Elements of TQM

TQM is not so much a theory or a philosophy (except in the loosest sense of the term) as a 'synthesis of previously well-known management practices and theory aimed at creating a particular organisational *culture* dedicated to producing high quality products and services' (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 97, emphasis added). It attempts to combine 'tough-minded thinking and tender-hearted feeling' (Lessem, 1991) by bringing together management by objectives, performance indicators, strategic planning, participative management and action learning. TQM assumes that most problems are systemic rather than caused by human error.

Although there is no single definition or approach to total quality management a number of issues can be found in most approaches:

- *Constant improvement*: quality improvement is a never-ending goal. There should be constant review of the customers' needs and constant attempts to improve the quality of the product or service.
- *Cultural change*: the implementation of TQM requires cultural change within the organisation. This includes instilling in employees the need for quality in everything they do; moving away from individualism towards mutual trust and interdependence; and developing a free flow of information, appropriate performance indicators and manage-

ment databases so that decisions can be based on evidence rather than supposition, tradition or prejudice.

- *Customer-driven definitions of quality*: outcomes should reflect customer requirements, needs or preferences. The standards that are set by the company should be dynamic and consistent with ever-changing customer requirements.
- *The 'quality chain'*: a product or service involves a process that links together a chain of customers and suppliers. The chain extends outside the organisation in two ways: backwards to the supplier of goods and services that the company purchases; and forwards to the end customer. The chain also operates within the organisation. Each employee or department supplies services or products to other departments and is, in turn, a customer of other internal departments. At each point there is a customer-supplier relationship.
- *Organisation-wide involvement in quality*: every aspect of an organisation is involved and every employee has an important role to play in improving the quality of the product or service.
- *Management commitment*: TQM requires the commitment of the top management and should be management-led. Management is responsible for setting and resourcing quality policy, providing motivation through leadership, and equipping people to achieve quality.
- *Team work*: team work helps to change the culture of the organisation from one of individual competitiveness to one of mutual interdependence and collaboration and helps to motivate the work force.
- *Built-in quality*: instead of final-stage quality control, TQM builds in quality at each stage in the process. Each supplier in the quality chain is responsible for the quality of the product or service he or she supplies.
- *Statistical techniques*: these are used to help improve quality. They can help measure the costs of quality, identify problems and resolve them.
- *Organisational structure*: the structure of an organisation must be designed to support quality improvement rather than inhibit it. It must allow everyone to have responsibility for quality, ensure barriers to communication are removed, allow those directly involved in a process to identify and implement quality improvement, and provide training for quality.

### Application of TQM to Education and Training

TQM has been tried out in higher education institutions in Britain, Australia and the US in recent years mainly as a result of increasing financial pressures and the need to 'behave like commercial enterprises in a fiercely competitive market' (Williams, 1993, p. 229). However, there has been little serious implementation of TQM in higher education and what has been tried has met with 'patchy success to date' (Yorke, 1993, p. 3).

In the US, only a handful of institutions are seriously committed to TQM despite being encouraged by funding bodies to adopt quality improvement procedures so as to become more effective and efficient (Muffo, 1992). Marchese (1991b) identified 24 institutions that have adopted TQM institution-wide, of which only five have any significant experience. Given that there are 3614 colleges in the US this is not a significant number.

In the wake of increasing pressures on efficiency there is a recent expansion in *interest* in TQM (Chaffee & Sherr, 1992; Seymour, 1992). Marchese (1992b) refers to an 'explosion of interest' in TQM amongst members of the American Association for Higher Education. A similar thing happened in Britain but the interest did not develop into implementation in higher education [2].

TQM, as it is currently being implemented in the US is all about being more productive and containing costs rather than improving the learning experience and attainment of students. Myrna Whittington at the University of Pennsylvania, for example, noted that the decision to turn to TQM was that 'we have to do more with less' and that 'our people had to be more productive' in the face of 'escalating costs, unhappy customers, sloppy services'. As TQM had worked for Motorola and Kodak it 'looked like a candidate for managing our affairs better' (Marchese, 1992a).

In Britain, it appears that only a handful of universities have attempted to implement TQM *across the institution*. In Australia, any initial steps at implementation are mainly restricted to Training and Further Education (TAFE) colleges. Similarly, in New Zealand, encouraged by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), TQM is currently fashionable in the non-university sector of post-16 education (NZQA, 1992, 1994). In Japan, in contrast to the situation in industry, TQM is a 'non-starter' in institutions of higher education (Harvey, 1993a; Warren Piper, 1993).

In higher education, TQM tends to be most frequently implemented initially on a small scale rather than changing the entire organisation. This may be because it is seen as having limited applicability and is directed to areas that seem most suited to it. For example, in the US the implementation of TQM has mainly been confined to administrative and service functions or to specific projects. Axland (1990) reports that half a sample of 78 American universities are using TQM principles to run their administrations, although in twelve cases this was confined to a particular area of administration. There was greater reluctance among universities concerned to apply TQM principles to their academic programmes.

In Australia, no higher education institution 'appears to be applying TQM across the board' (NBEET HEC, 1992b, p. 70). However, some are applying it to specific areas. The University of New South Wales, for example, has implemented TQM in its buildings and facilities areas and both the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) and the University of Queensland have both instigated TQM projects in the area of student registration and induction. Where TQM has been applied in universities it has most often been to administrative and service departments as the likelihood of success is higher there (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 98).

### **Institution-wide or Small-scale Implementation**

The literature on TQM implementation in higher education, particularly from the US, strongly advises starting with projects that are of manageable size, have campus-wide visibility and impact, and promise savings. This is at variance with the total approach in industry.

However, it may be that institution managers, rather than go for a 'process that's fixable, important to customers and that can save you money' (Coate, 1990), adopt a partial approach out of caution. Often, managers are hesitant about TQM and want to pilot it in one small area before extending the process (Marchese, 1991b). At Crawley College, for example, the School of Engineering was given permission to go ahead with a pilot for a quality system as a forerunner to the implementation of a college-wide quality system (Turner, 1993).

In some cases the incremental approach occurs because a small group want to demonstrate, by results, how TQM can work and thus hope to convert the rest of the institution—the ‘infection model’ (Seymour & Collet, 1991). At the Universities of Bradford (Porter & Oakland, 1992) and Northumbria (Prabhu & Lee, 1992) implementation began in the Business School where staff were familiar with the concept of TQM. There is, however, little evidence to suggest that these small-scale, limited introductions lead to full-scale implementation.

The whole college ‘cascade approach’ (Seymour & Collet, 1991), based on centrally planned introduction, which has the full support of the senior management, is rare. Among those documented are Aston (Clayton, 1992), South Bank (Geddes, 1992), Oregon State (Coate, 1990, 1993) Pennsylvania (Marchese, 1992a) and Fox Valley Technical College (Spanbauer, 1987).

Even where there is a total commitment to TQM, implementation in universities is not as institution-wide as it might appear. At South Bank, for example, the emphasis has initially been on the internal customer-supplier chain and the main effort has been in the development of customer-service agreements (South Bank University, 1992). At Aston, the effective introduction has been mainly in non-academic areas. The development of quality circles is an important feature of staff development for TQM and it is indicative that they have been set up to address such things as maintenance, cleaning, health and safety, communications, security, catering, finance, personnel, reprography and student care (Ager *et al.*, 1992). Introduction of TQM in Australia and New Zealand tends also to be heavily linked to administrative functions (Jackson, 1994; Garlick, 1994).

It is not surprising that TQM implementation has been so limited and tentative. There are significant problems with introducing TQM to education, both practical and theoretical. Many of the difficulties with the application of TQM to higher education are ‘generic’ problems of TQM.

### ‘Generic’ Problems of TQM

Despite the enthusiasm for TQM in industry, success in applying TQM is less widespread than advocates suggest. Those companies that have been successful through using TQM are widely publicised. Little or no publicity is attached to the thousands of companies who used TQM but still failed, or who abandoned TQM because it was not having any positive impact. Surveys of TQM users show widespread dissatisfaction, with a ‘success rate of less than 30%’. Harari (1993, p. 33), for example reported that only 20–30% of TQM organisations claim to have achieved ‘significant or even tangible improvement in quality, productivity, competitiveness or financial returns’. Similarly, Myers & Ashkenas (1993) found that two-thirds of firms surveyed felt their TQM programmes were failing to have any impact.

TQM has not been transplanted easily to the service sector. For example, an extensive action-research study of implementation of TQM in the British National Health Service showed that of 38 sites undertaking quality initiatives, only two successfully implemented TQM. In conclusion the research indicated that an ‘orthodox’ TQM approach would be unsuitable and that a ‘mixed model should be implemented. ... It would allow for the particular strengths and complexities in the National Health Service which depends upon the integration of many forms of professional expertise’ (Joss *et al.*, 1994).

There are two kinds of problem identified by critics of TQM. First, criticisms that suggest the whole approach is fundamentally flawed. Second, criticisms that relate to the ‘internal’

failings of TQM. Much of this latter criticism relates to the different emphases that different approaches place on elements of TQM. The 'fundamental' criticisms include the following.

- TQM is not customer-driven. There is no evidence, for the vast majority of TQM organisations, that individual customers specify *in advance* what is required. Even where specifications 'originate' with an 'ideal type' customer via market research the product will be 'mediated by cost, available technology, time, marketing (such as advertising) and so on' (Harvey & Green, 1993, p. 17). Priorities are not set on the basis of customer requirements, indeed, they are often not set at all (Goodman *et al.*, 1994).
- TQM focuses people's attention on internal processes rather than external results.
- TQM is intrinsically bureaucratic and leads to additional burdensome procedures (Hill, 1993). It tends to add new layers of organisational management rather than effect radical organisational reform. Similarly, it fails to demand new arrangements with outside organisations and changes in management compensation (Harari, 1993).
- TQM focuses on minimum standards rather than striving for high standards of excellence.
- TQM may shift the emphasis away from quality control but instead it delegates quality to specialists and experts. The notion that everyone is responsible for quality in a TQM system is a sham.

As we have seen, TQM is varied and not all commentators would necessarily agree that the above are generic problems that are fundamental to any TQM approach. It may be argued that, at root, all these are practical problems of implementation and that, in principal, TQM is customer driven, results do matter, it is not necessarily bureaucratic, it can strive to high standards and everyone is given responsibility for quality.

Frequently cited 'internal' problems with TQM include the following.

- Organisations fail to achieve the required level of communication for effective TQM implementation because there is rarely a shared vision and middle managers, in an attempt to retain power, act as a communication block (Stevenson & Donnelly, 1994).
- TQM inhibits innovation and undermines entrepreneurship by standardising and routinising internal processes, leading to a formulaic approach, which is sterile and mechanistic (Harari, 1993).
- TQM fails because it lacks rigorous measurement of results (Goodman *et al.*, 1994).
- TQM is viewed by new users as a 'quick fix' to help them overcome their problems. The TQM literature clearly indicates that implementation is not a rapid process, that it involves a change of culture and that the impact is long-term. However, this is often overlooked by enthusiastic vendors of TQM programmes desperate to sell their wares and by purchasers, desperate for results, who think they can effect rapid implementation.
- Participation in decision making at all levels rarely takes place. Those with power wish to retain it and much decision making is merely rubber-stamping decisions of top managers (Stevenson & Donnelly, 1994).
- Too many versions of TQM fail to focus on outcomes, preferring, instead, rather more vague notions such as 'continual improvement', 'management by objectives', 'performance appraisal' or 'zero defects'.

These failings are less vehemently defended by TQM advocates as they accept that there will always be initial problems of implementation until organisational culture is changed and that some approaches to TQM have different priorities to others.

### Problems of Implementing TQM in Higher Education

Many of the problems of implementing TQM in higher education include problems of identification of customers and products, specifying a customer-driven 'definition' of quality, and introducing a managed 'quality culture' based on an industrial model.

#### *Customers and Product—the educational experience*

Commentators on TQM suggest that any or all of the following may be seen as the *product* of higher education: education, knowledge, research (applied and other), scholarship, arts and culture, criticism of society and students. Thus, the *customers* (or clients) include: students, academic disciplines, employers, funders, parents, government and society.

Students are both product and customer, which undermines the model. Similarly, if 'critique of society' is a product the supplier–customer model breaks down because staff and students combined are suppliers of critique to society or government who are often unwilling customers and who rarely seek the product (Warren-Piper, 1993).

The plurality of the university's customer means that sometimes the products or goals of the university are in conflict. Thus universities have a role in moderating competing needs and expectations and in taking responsibility for final judgements (NBEET HEC, 1992). This leads to another problem for TQM as prioritising competing needs normally requires market values in order to make a decision. 'These complexities, which do not occur in manufacturing, and which are only faintly reflected in service industries, make the application of TQM to the university enterprise a complex one' (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 99).

It is therefore not surprising that TQM in higher education has been focused on academic support services, given the relative ease with which their customers can be identified. Similarly, the institutions at the forefront of developments of TQM in higher education in the USA are the prominent research universities and the local community colleges. This may be because these institutions find it easier to articulate their mission in clear and unambiguous terms and hence it is easier to identify product and customer (Marchese, 1991b). For example, the apparent success at Fox Valley Technical College may be due to it having a specific vocational focus on business quality.

#### *Identifying Student Requirements*

From the TQM perspective, the needs of customers must come first and should determine the quality standards the institution must satisfy. TQM derives from manufacturing where the product is usually identifiable and customer requirements in relation to the product can be established, at least within some broad parameters.

There are more difficulties in applying TQM in service industries, not least because the product and the consequent needs of customers are less readily identified (Roberts, 1990; Newby, 1992). Buyers of manufactured products are disengaged from the organisation producing the product. In the service sector, the customer is less clearly separated from the product and there is a lack of homogeneity in customer requirements and expectations, which leads to problems in defining the product and in understanding customers' needs (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 98).

Attempts to define customer needs in the service sector have focused on distinguishing the service *process* in which the 'customer' is involved and the service *outcome*. The emphasis has been not so much on fulfilling stated customer needs but attempting to measure satisfaction (Grönroos, 1984; Parasuraman *et al.*, 1985; Zeithaml *et al.*, 1990). Satisfaction approaches might help to identify a narrow range of 'customer' priorities and satisfactions (Bell & Shieff, 1990; Ramaseshan & Pitt, 1990) but this does not help to reconcile vague expectations with professional expertise.

#### *Customer or Participant?*

Talk of customers, of satisfying needs, of getting things right first time, and of educational products are far removed from the idea of a student as *participant* in a process of learning. Despite attempts to adapt TQM to take account of students as participants in a process of self-development, the genesis and focus of TQM fundamentally inhibits its suitability as a participatory model.

TQM is about organisational procedures designed to ensure that customer requirements are fulfilled. It is about producing an end-product consistently, or constantly improving processes so that requirements are met as nearly as possible and efficiently and effectively as possible. At the heart of TQM is a concept of customer receiving a product.

In short, TQM does not address *transformation* (Harvey & Green, 1993). Higher education is fundamentally about transforming students through empowering students through the enhancement of their knowledge and skills. TQM is essentially reductionist—'production or service possibilities are analysed by stages' (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 97)—it does not see the student learning experience as part of a holistic process.

The disregard for the transformative notion of education and replacement with a customer-perspective, dressed up in managerialist language (Carothers, 1992), leads many academics to regard quality systems as faddish and not worthy of being seriously engaged. In essence, TQM is about providing a product to satisfy the end-customer it is not about transforming a participant.

#### *Uniformity or Variation?*

Many of the quality assurance processes in industry, and to some extent the service sector, are concerned with a consistent product or outcome. For example, Crosby's model emphasises uniformity of 'product', delivered without defects. This emphasis on consistency might be all right for mass-produced components or consumer products but it entirely disregards the exploratory nature of learning. A consistency approach is, therefore, hardly commensurate with higher learning (Holloway, 1993; Baldwin, 1994; Harvey, 1994; Woodhouse, 1994).

#### *Teaching and Learning*

With a few exceptions (Müller & Funnell, 1991, 1992, 1993; Walley, 1992; Hansen, 1993) discussions of the implementation of TQM in higher education are extremely reticent to discuss, let alone provide evidence of, the potential impact on the quality of the teaching and learning process. This, in part, reflects the deliberate distancing of teaching and learning from TQM in some institutions.

Holloway (1993, pp. 12–13) reports that at the Open University, in Britain, some academic staff involved in TQM implementation, believed 'that there is something essen-



tial about “teaching quality” which should remain outside the remit of TQM. A similar limit to the domain of TQM is reported in other HEIs in the UK and abroad, and has a parallel in medical practice’. The practice of ‘starting with the “soft targets” of support services and to ease off when the examination of internal customer-supplier chains reaches academic staff, appears to be a common experience in the UK, US and New Zealand’.

### *Costs and Time*

There is little hard evidence about the costs of implementing TQM. However, Oregon State University estimates that at least 20% of the time of people involved in projects being assisted by TQM processes is given over to the implementation of TQM itself (Coate, 1990). In health contexts it has been suggested that the financial costs of TQM implementation are quite high, for example, Brooks (1992) estimated a cost of £500,000 over 3 years for a hospital with 2000 staff.

Seymour (1991) suggests that, although it is too early to tell, there is a cost-benefit trade-off at the project-level where the implementation has met with more success than when implemented institution-wide. This raises questions, though, of how, for example, is the ‘price of non-conformance’, such as a cancelled lecture, determined? Is it possible to quantify ‘good quality tuition’ in financial terms?

For staff, the real obstacle, even if they are inclined towards TQM, is one of time. The pressure on staff from increased student numbers and a declining unit of resource is leading towards a culture of ‘getting by’, let alone embracing irrelevant activities that eat into their time (Yorke, 1993, p. 6). Quality systems are seen as increasing work loads and administrative burdens on teachers who are already expected to do more.

Furthermore, the benefits of TQM are not immediately apparent, there is a long time-lag of from three to ten years between initiation and expected benefits from full implementation (Coate, 1990; Schofield *et al.*, 1991; Clayton, 1992).

### *Staff Resistance*

Scepticism and cynicism flourish amongst academics who tend to be more conservative than radical in their view of the higher education process. This cynicism is accentuated by a distaste for the evangelicalism associated with TQM (Baldwin, 1994).

Often, in practice resistance is underestimated and necessary groundwork has not always been done to gain assent and sustained support from staff (Yorke, 1993). Nor can this cynicism be ignored because there will be tension between TQM practitioners and non-practitioners in the same institution. In addition, extensive cynicism will make it difficult to achieve a ‘critical mass’ to support the institutionalisation of TQM and get beneath surface-level applications (Seymour, 1991). It also reduces the potential for developing teamwork, consensus-building and conflict resolution, all of which are vital elements of TQM implementation and difficult enough to achieve in an academic environment at the best of times. Staff resistance to TQM is significant and takes a number of forms, including:

- *suspicion of management motives*: many staff are resistant because they see TQM as another ploy that increases managerial control and undermines academic autonomy. However, in ironic contrast to employee resistance, a lack of wholehearted support often reflects the concern of managers that TQM would lead to a loss of managerial control (Seymour, 1991; Harvey, 1993b);
- *resentment*: there is resentment at the inference that the failings of the institution, brought

about by inadequate or inappropriate allocation of resources, are being blamed on staff. Teaching staff at Crawley College, for example, 'were very sensitive about any implications that they were not giving a quality service already' (Turner, 1993, p. 20) a point echoed by library staff at the University of Western Sydney (Stevenson & Donnelly, 1994);

- *failure of trust*: for many academics, the introduction of any quality system implies a criticism of the quality of their work hitherto and a lack of trust in the work force. These concerns are not allayed by the emphasis placed, by many versions of TQM, on the need to place trust in the workers to fulfil their responsibilities.

### *Team Working*

TQM places considerable emphasis on working in teams. In many respects this is an alien process for many academics who are not only used to working alone but who are valued by their institutions for their individual contribution. Team working, traditionally, has been a restricted activity for academics, limited to some larger research projects, to course-scheme design for externally accredited courses (such as by awarding, professional or regulatory bodies) and team-teaching. For most academics, individual teaching and scholarship are the norm.

It is not surprising that, in higher education settings, TQM is introduced into areas where team-working already exists and where the team has a fairly straightforward task. However, some reports suggest that TQM, in such circumstances can do more harm than good by threatening the existing team-working processes.

For example, the University of Western Sydney introduced a pilot TQM into the Collection Services Department of its Library with a view to examining the processing and turnaround time for book purchasing. Senior managers were aware of the resentment and scepticism that TQM could generate but, even forewarned, were unable to allay the problems caused by the external facilitator (Stevenson & Donnelly, 1994). The introduction of TQM in this case almost destroyed a process that was already underway and it was only with the ejection of the TQM facilitator from the group that the team was able to return to an effective way of working. A similar situation was reported at Oregon State University Library where staff were resentful of TQM because they already used participative problem-solving (Butcher, 1993). Again, in this case, the TQM trainer nearly caused disaster.

### *Increased Bureaucracy and Burden of Work*

Quality management is sometimes seen, justifiably, as resulting in increased layers of management, not flatter organisational structures, which is at variance with practice in commerce and industry. At Crawley College, for example, the pilot introduction of TQM did not proceed smoothly as there was considerable resistance to what amounted to the introduction of an additional layer of middle managers, who among other things, 'have responsibility for driving the quality initiative in their area' (Turner, 1993, p. 29).

TQM, it is claimed, ought to work better in semi-autonomous situations because it is based on mobilising organisational culture rather than a reliance on bureaucratic procedures (Drucker, 1991). However, TQM leads to major gains in effectiveness and cost savings when 'cross-cutting functions' are addressed, for example, enrolments management, where central administrative processing is linked to academic decision-making

about student admissions. However, cross-functional change tends to be difficult in a collegiate ethos of semi-autonomous units.

Implementing TQM is also seen to involve an intolerable and unnecessary burden of work with no discernible pay-off in the academic context.

### *Measurement and Statistical Procedures*

A major area of resistance is the measurement of quality. Given the diversity of customers and products there is little agreement about suitable quantitative benchmarks. Some staff are suspicious of statistical focus of TQM, 'since they feel it will tend to introduce an inappropriate levelling of healthy diversity' (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 91). This reflects the protracted debate about the appropriateness and nature of performance indicators in higher education.

Thus, the emphasis placed on statistical procedures by some approaches to TQM acts as much as a major demotivator for some staff as 'managerialist jargon' (QUT, 1990). For others, however, the statistics are opposed on the ground that they are inadequate or irrelevant to the quality monitoring or improvement processes. For example, the first attempt to introduce TQM in the Science Faculty at Queensland University of Technology overemphasised statistics. The attempt was abandoned as heads and deans who were the subject of the attempted TQM-implementation were insulted by the disregard for their own level of expertise in statistics. They regarded statistics as irrelevant to their quality concerns—they could critique statistical approaches from a position of considerable knowledge of the limitations of such techniques.

### **Repackaging**

There is a tendency among TQM enthusiasts to repackaging a range of research and management procedures as their own, and to 'ascribe all improvements, however initiated, to TQM' (Woodhouse, 1994).

For example, there are a growing number of commentators offering advice when introducing TQM into a service environment (Saraph *et al.*, 1989; Holmes, 1991; Schofield *et al.*, 1991; Binney, 1992; Coulson-Thomas, 1992; Zairi, 1992; Garvin, 1983; Kalunzny *et al.*, 1993). Important features of successful implementation of TQM in the service sector that emerge from these include: a passion about quality; a belief in people and their potential; flat organisational structures; commitment of leaders and key stakeholders; simple informal communication systems; genuine commitment to listen to employees and respond rapidly to their comments; minimising perceived threats to power bases; and so on.

The question arises as to whether this list of 'critical success factors' are unique to TQM. 'They may be just as relevant to strategic planning, organisational development or human resource management' (Holloway, 1993, p. 9).

Similarly, market research tools such as customer-satisfaction surveys are being claimed as TQM approaches (Cliff, 1994). Indeed, a whole range of basic social research techniques are repackaged as TQM techniques. Juran (1988, p. 210), for example, suggests that TQM involves 'planned, systematic collection of data on multiple process variables and the associated product results. The data are then systematically analysed to establish the relationships'. This is nothing more than multivariate analysis: for 'process variables' read 'independent variable' and for 'product results' read 'dependent variable'.

Similarly, in an education setting, Jackson (1994) repackages simple social research when

claiming that monitoring the teaching of quantitative subjects in non-quantitative degrees at La Trobe University involves using 'TQM techniques':

The technique involves development of a longitudinal database, where data is collected over time, to gain a greater understanding of the process, which is the subject, and the relationship between its inputs and its outputs. With a better understanding of the process and identification of problems within it, it will be possible to take actions to improve the process and hence, hopefully, the outcomes. ... Taking the introductory statistics subject as the process to which students are subjected and viewing the students as both inputs and outputs, the longitudinal database is used to collect data upon process variables (student characteristics) and product results (performance in subject) (Jackson, 1994, pp. 89–91).

Closer analysis shows that this is nothing more than standard longitudinal action research, based on multivariate analysis.

However, the repackaging suggests three respects in which TQM differs from most social research. First, TQM is much more clearly reductionist. Although some forms of positivist social research use reductionist, system models to identify key factors in a process, this is rarely as clear cut as the system-analysis model underlying much of TQM.

Second, TQM makes clearer links between research and action than much conventional social research, which tends to be hesitant about the politics of informing policy or specifying action. However, critical research has never had a problem in identifying the political implications of its work (Lynd, 1939; Mills, 1959; Habermas, 1970; Harvey, 1990). Similarly, social policy research, action research and evaluation research all have clear agendas that link research findings to recommendations for action (for example, Ben-Tovim *et al.*, 1986).

Third, TQM makes much of the transformation of data into actionable information. This is a difference of focus. Social research transforms data into evidence in developing a deeper theoretical understanding of an issue. TQM is more restrictive in its focus and requires only that data is processed into *management information*. This reflects the managerialist concerns of TQM rather than a deeper understanding of social processes. However, one should avoid assuming that the production of management information is itself a 'TQM technique'.

The claim that all improvements in education are due to TQM extends to a range of standard practices as diverse as periodic review of courses, monitoring of student assessment turnaround, team development of new courses, devising student coursework assessment criteria, end-of-session summary feedback procedures, as well as a host of other teaching and learning 'innovations' and staff development processes.

Repackaging an old product does not make it a new product. However, as in the case of TQM, it can be marketed as something new. It might be argued that TQM is predatory and nothing more than an assemblage of good management practices, statistical procedures and common-sense underpinned by a simplistic philosophy designed to spread the responsibility for quality outcomes (Holloway, 1993, p. 2).

Repackaging is an attempt to give TQM a legitimacy and it has facilitated the resale of old ideas. The more it attempts to infiltrate realms it was not designed for the more the predatory and eclectic nature of TQM is revealed. In higher education, TQM has nothing new to offer other than reminding us of established procedures and responsibilities.

### From TQM-implementation to Collegialism

It appears that there is a lot of effort, energy and resources expended on inaugurating TQM and related systems but little evidence that they have any major impact across the higher education system nor that they deliver any improvement at the staff-student interface. There are innumerable bullet-point papers that provide lists of things to do when setting up TQM systems but very few that critically evaluate the potential, let alone actual, impact of such systems in higher education. There is not much to suggest that TQM is other than yet another passing fad:

We have experienced a string of fads proclaiming the same institutional success including Statistical Process Control, Long-Range Planning, Strategic Planning, Management by Objectives, Zero-Based Budgeting, O & M (Organisation and Methods) Theory 'Z', Theory 'K', Job Enrichment, the energetic Management-by-Walking-About, the Management Audit, Value-Added Planning, Work-Place Reform and the various other theories through which scholars and practitioners have earned their fame, their theses, their MBAs and their consultancy fees. (Hinchcliffe, 1994, pp. 161–2)

There is no overwhelming evidence that, in the higher education context, TQM does you good. This does not mean that those institutions who have embraced TQM are wrong. Some institutions have doubtless benefited from the adoption of TQM. Most, it appears, are sceptical. TQM is certainly not an option an institution should take just because it may have been of some use somewhere else. It is essential to evaluate the potential benefits carefully and estimate costs of all kinds before embarking on what might be an unnecessary voyage. Indeed, what may accrue to higher education from TQM might be much more readily and effectively gained by encouraging collegial responsibility (Dill, 1993).

There is no compelling evidence that TQM will become a major aspect of quality monitoring and development in higher education. Indeed, interest in its potential is already beginning to wane, judging by contributions to major national and international conferences, seminars and colloquia. Two years ago parallel sessions on TQM in education used to attract far more than the average number of respondents. For example, at the *QHE* 24-Hour seminar in January 1993 the TQM-related session was by far the most popular. Anecdotal evidence suggests that TQM-related sessions are now seen as somewhat *passé*. Indicative of this is the cancellation of the first national conference on TQM in higher education due to have taken place in Britain in early 1995.

Does this suggest that TQM should be written-off as far as higher education is concerned? As David Dill (1995) has persuasively argued, there are some important lessons to be learned from TQM—not least the central place of human capital in organisations. In the educational contest, this reaffirms the need for the revitalisation of collegiality. In going *beyond* TQM it is the reassessment and reorientation of collegiate values and the strengthening of collegialism which provides the context in which the lessons of TQM can most beneficially be situated.

### Collegialism

Collegialism is a term meant to imply the institutionalisation of aspects of collegial practices and aspirations. Collegialism is characterised by three core elements:

- a process of shared decision-making by a collegial group in relation to academic matters:

Unlike a business with a clear management structure, in a university 'no individual has over-riding power of action, but many have enough power for obstruction, and decision-making is difficult, even in the most minor matters. Change in university comes about through many tiny increments, no one of which is large enough to rock the boat. These increments are represented as small reasonable remedies in response to great pressures, and take account of personal and territorial interests. The collegiate approach leads to a lack of individual accountability: everyone must agree, but no one is accountable. (Woodhouse, 1994, p. 26)

- mutual support in upholding the academic integrity of members of the group;
- conservation of a realm of special knowledge and practice.

Collegialism takes a variety of forms but can be characterised as a continuum with 'cloisterism' at one end and the 'new collegialism' at the other (Harvey, 1995).

### *Cloisterism*

Cloisterism is about the reaffirmation of the power of the scholar. It attempts to reassert the centrality of academic autonomy. It sees the 'college' as a bastion within which scholars are united in their desire to ensure their academic freedom and individual autonomy. Scholars emphasise the absolute right of the collegial group to make decisions relating to academic matters, regards the integrity of members as inviolable (except where exceptionally challenged from within), and considers the role of group as that of developing and defending its specialist realm, which is usually discipline-based.

Cloisterism tends to be staff-directed, producer-oriented and research-dominated.

It sees students as novices to be initiated into the mysteries of the discipline. It is effectively inward looking. The knowledge it possesses is revealed incrementally and according to the dictates of the self-appointed 'owners'. The skills and abilities it expects students to develop are often implicit and obscure. Sometimes the expectations of students are deliberately opaque and shrouded in mystifying discourse. (Harvey, 1995, p. 153)

The cloisterist response to external quality monitoring is to equate it with the growth of managerialism. This has led to widespread cynicism, resentment and lack of trust amongst some academics. One reaction has been further retrenchment and reification of cloisterism through increased demands for academic freedom (McConkey, 1995), calls to maintain an élite set of institutions (Hughes, 1994; THES, 1994) or the concentration of research monies in 'established' institutions (Wojtas, 1994).

### *The New Collegialism*

New collegialism is outward-looking and responsive to changing circumstances and requirements. It sees the collegial group as the forum for academic decision making but is prepared to enlarge that group to allow discourse and negotiation with significant others, not least students (Roper, 1993; Barnett, 1994; Haselgrove, 1994; Gibbs, 1995; Erwin & Knight, 1995). It emphasises accountable professional expertise rather than the inviolable academic integrity. Its perceived role is one of widely disseminating knowledge and understanding through whatever learning-facilitation and knowledge-production processes are most effective.

The new collegialism emphasises professional accountability and co-operation and in this it reflects two key elements of TQM: delegated responsibility for quality and team work. The new collegialism emphasises continuous improvement within the existing academic framework.

Despite a wariness of managerialism, the growing requirement for accountability and the consequent increase in external quality monitoring has been actively developed within new collegiate settings. It has provided the opportunity to grasp the initiative and reassess traditional collegiate allegiances and prerogatives including an acceptance of a widened set of responsibilities. This is evident in the growing transparency of practices and procedures within higher education (HEQC, 1994; Porter, 1994). Academic autonomy in the new-collegiate approach comes through ownership of the quality-improvement process and the development of an explicit professionalism (Elton, 1992; Rear, 1994a, b; Warren Piper, 1994).

The new collegialism is learning-oriented. It focuses on facilitating student learning rather than teaching, and explicitly encourages the development of a range of skills and abilities. It prefers transparency to obscurity.

The emphasis, in teaching and learning, is on facilitating active learning through clear identification of aims and outcomes within an integrated approach that links objectives, content, teaching practices, assessment and student attainment (Barnett, 1992; Race, 1993; Brown & Knight, 1994; Knight, 1995). Greater emphasis is being placed on team work to ensure the coherence of the student experience.

For example, North East Wales Institute (NEWI, 1994) is developing a responsive collegiate approach. Their quality framework emphasises team working and devolved responsibility. It enables:

course teams to use monitoring and evaluation as tools for: *improving effectiveness* by establishing priorities, setting targets and taking stock of outcomes and progress; *improving process* by using materials in the *Course Team Quality File* for the purpose of reviewing and improving the processes of teaching and learning; *learning* by encouraging the notion of a 'learning community' which is committed to increasing knowledge and understanding by engaging in teaching and research; encouraging ownership and ensuring that this is retained by course teams who are able to make their own professional judgements on data collection, analysis and interpretation of matters relating to service standards and improvement methodology. (NEWI, 1994, p. 1)

Teaching is no longer only seen as something that happens in private between consenting adults (Warren Piper, 1994). Dialogue and discussion have traditionally been the hallmarks of research in the collegiate setting and this is being reasserted in response to the competitive pressures being placed on individuals through various forms of research-output assessment that can be found throughout the world.

Continuous quality improvement is a key feature of new collegialism. It is an integral part of the culture of quality that underpins self-critical reflection and the acceptance of responsibility for quality development. The cloisterist approach questions the 'philosophy' of continuous improvement as it implies that there is something wrong with what is being provided or produced. The new-collegiate approach sees continuous improvement as a dynamic force that meshes with procedures of innovation and change at the heart of the academic process. In this respect, new collegialism parallels elements of some forms of TQM (Tannock, 1991; Holloway, 1993).

On the face of it TQM has characteristics which would fit in well with the ethos of a university. To start with, people themselves are responsible for the quality of their own work. Instead of there being some inspectorate, or a senior manager making judgement, a system is created whereby everybody is given evidence about the effect of their own decisions and standards of work. They are left to react in whatever way they think fit. The main incentive for improvement is an individual's own self-respect. A commitment to high standards is maintained through the social pressure of working with colleagues who are jointly committed to a high quality product or service. The responsibility of senior staff is the creation and maintenance of a culture in which quality is recognised and prized, rather than the monitoring and evaluation of individual performance. This is very much as professionals in general and academics in particular expect to work. (Warren Piper, 1993, pp. 97–8)

### External Quality Monitoring and the New Collegialism

Part of the responsiveness of higher education, at least in the medium term, must involve a recognition of an obligation to external quality monitoring processes. Thus the development of a quality approach within higher education cannot be considered solely in terms of internal management processes. Higher education must address its responsibilities to the wider community, including taxpayers and government, through its quality procedures (Dill, 1992). However, there is a tension between quality monitoring for accountability and quality monitoring for enhancement.

The development of the new collegialism provides a vehicle to resolve the tension between accountability and quality improvement (Sanders, 1994; Vroeijenstijn, 1994; Brown, 1995; Harvey, 1994, 1995).

The new-collegiate approach emphasises the development of a quality culture of continuous improvement. A necessary element of this process is a self-critical collegiate group, prepared to set their own agenda for improvement and to ensure action to fulfil quality commitments. Most accountability-led external monitoring deters a self-critical approach and encourages compliance (van Vught, 1991). This makes it difficult for a culture of continuous quality improvement to flourish in a climate dominated by external accountability.

The question is how does a new-collegiate approach, which endorses transformative, empowering education, driven by a responsive collegiate group, relate to accountability-driven, external quality monitoring?

Continuous quality improvement, sees quality in terms of a process of transformation. The accountability-led view sees improvement as a secondary function of the monitoring process. The assumption is that improvement will take place as a result of becoming accountable (Commonwealth of Australia, 1991; DES, 1991; NGA, 1991; H.M. Government, 1992). Available research (e.g. Westerheijden *et al.*, 1994) and anecdotal evidence suggests that accountability approaches may encourage initial improvement (where accountability requires the production of strategic plans, clear objectives, quality assurance systems, and so on) but have no lasting impact in terms of continuous improvement.

The word 'quality' was on the lips of the majority of administrators and academics in higher education at the time of the reviews [in Australia], but this seems to have subsided, at least until the next review which is to take place in 1994. (Calway & Murphy, 1994)



In terms of the continuum—bounded by cloisterism and new collegialism—external monitoring aimed primarily at *accountability* will effect improvement at one end of the spectrum but is likely to act as an inhibitor at the other end. Cloisterism may be disturbed by requirements that clear aims and objectives are made explicit, that the coherence of a student's programme of study is carefully considered, and that procedures for assessing student progress are transparent. External monitoring, by requiring these accountable procedures, may produce a sufficient initial impetus to shift an academic group from a cloisterist mode of operation to a responsive mode. The problem is that once the shift has occurred, there is little in external accountability models to ensure a continued process of improvement. Indeed, having to continuously respond to accountability requirements may lead to a reduction in the time and energy invested in innovation and improvement.

A *continuous* process of quality improvement shifts the primary emphasis on quality from external scrutiny to internal effective action (Bauer & Franke-Wikberg, 1993). In terms of teaching and learning this means devising a quality system that drives improvement from the *staff-student interface*, which is precisely what is embodied in the new-collegiate approach. The problem is that the quality-improvement approach must also mesh with external requirements for accountability.

What is involved is to respond to top-down accountability-led monitoring through a process of bottom-up continuous quality improvement. In a sense, this means that initiative must be grasped via the internal procedures. This will only be feasible with an academic body that is prepared to adopt new-collegiate principles of responsiveness. A cloisterist approach hands the initiative to external bodies. A new-collegiate approach grasps the initiative and demonstrates that accountability is achieved through a process of continuous quality improvement.

A possible approach would involve the development of operational teams, who take responsibility for quality, set their own agendas for action, report their intentions, actions and consequent achievements. The process would be internally audited and the cumulative product reported by the institution, in an annual quality report, to an appropriate external body. The external body would, as appropriate, arrange a periodic audit of the institutional quality reports, through whatever device (such as peer review) that it deemed necessary, to validate the veracity of the quality document. It would operate in principle, in a similar way to the audit of the financial accounts (Harvey, 1994, 1995).

The new-collegiate approach reverses the view that accountability will lead to quality improvement. The new-collegiate approach prioritises a dynamic quality monitoring process linked to effective action. In so doing it ensures that accountability will inevitably follow from the process of continuous quality improvement. It has the additional advantage of providing a more democratic power base for accountability processes and may counteract the tendency towards a managerial style that overwhelms traditional Senate-based democratic processes [3]. Furthermore, accountability will be achieved at reduced cost, through a reduced burden on the institution and less aggravation and hostility from staff. There will be an increased pay-off in terms of quality improvement than would arise from a compliant culture located in the hostile, conflict-ridden and suspicion-laden environment that characterises a cloisterist reaction to accountability-led external monitoring.

In summary:

the improvement-led approach of the new collegialism involves both a 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' approach embedded in a quality-improvement culture. That culture rests on a new professionalism that is prepared to address issues beyond the mysteries of the academic discipline. It requires a commitment to open,

transparent ways of working and the grasping of the responsibility for quality which it is prepared to address overtly and publicly. (Harvey, 1995)

## Conclusion

Some institutions in the UK, the US and Australasia are in the early stages of implementing quality assurance systems based on TQM (Cowles & Gilbreath, 1992).

There are problems in implementing TQM, which relate to the limited scope of the definitions of quality; identification of what is the product and who are the customers; defining organisational objectives with clarity; measuring and controlling processes related to teaching and learning; and exploring the role students play in their own learning. There is a danger that the importance given to measuring processes in both approaches may lead to an over-emphasis on aspects of higher education which are easily measurable at the expense of other areas.

There are elements of TQM that are portable to the higher education context. TQM, in particular, requires recognition that everyone in an organisation has a role to play in improving quality. It can, therefore, be used to look at the quality of the whole organisation, not just the quality of courses. A TQM ethos, tailored to the academic setting, could also be useful in developing work-based learning partnerships and industry-led courses. Situating learning in the workplace will be an option that will grow in the future, and common understandings between academia and industry will facilitate such developments [4].

Although the application of TQM to higher education is in its early stages there is little indication that TQM has had any impact on, let alone improved, quality at the teaching and learning interface. Similarly, TQM is 'likely to have nothing *directly* to say about the creativity involved in research' (Warren Piper, 1993, p. 100).

The *supposed* benefits of TQM to higher education include involvement of staff in the improvement of their own working environment; a clearer idea of what the organisation is about and the individual's role in this; the institution's ability to be responsible and accountable for the services it provides; a shift of priorities from policy and rule-generation to learning about customer expectations and requirements; improved morale and changed attitudes; intuition and tradition replaced by fact-based decisions; breaking down interdepartmental divisions through teamwork and the development of a common-language to solve problems (although one better suited to higher education than the existing business-oriented language of TQM) (Seymour, 1991).

There is nothing here that the new collegialism does not embrace. However, while TQM is unlikely to take-off in higher education, elements of it have been absorbed into a new collegiate approach. This absorption of some tenets of TQM has led to an explicit expression of the workings of collegialism and the nature of academic autonomy and professionalism (Warren Piper, 1994). It has, thus, helped to call into question the mysticism of academic cloisterism.

Parallels between new collegialism and aspects of some forms of TQM have been highlighted. However, they are *fundamentally* different despite some common ground, such as delegated responsibility for quality, team working and the culture of continuous quality improvement.

At root, TQM is fixated on a product or service supplied to a customer (or client). Higher education is a participative process. There is no simple, discernible end-product of higher education, it is an ongoing transformative process that continues to make an impact long after any formal programme of study has been completed. In essence, TQM addresses a

partial 'pragmatic' notion of quality that is of marginal use in the context of higher learning and knowledge development. The new collegialism adopts a transformative notion of quality that embraces process and change rather than adherence to a static specification of a product.

Effort might be more profitably directed to encouraging the development of open, self-reflective collegialism rather than the importation of expensive, bureaucratic, unwieldy, alienating managerialist approaches from industry. The way forward for continuous quality improvement in higher education is through the new collegialism. In essence, it is time to go beyond TQM to develop a new collegialism responsive to the twenty-first century.

### Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank David Dill, Peter Knight, Selena Mason, David Woodhouse and Phil Meade and all the discussants at the INQAAHE Conference in Utrecht, 1995 for their comments on earlier drafts.

### Notes

[1] Managerialism refers to the tendency in higher education for professional managers to play a much more significant role in decision-making in higher education. Decision-making that has a profound impact on academic processes and quality but which is based on non-academic criteria—often financial criteria or as the result of managerial theory or fashion (Miller, 1994). Finance is raised from the status of a parameter within which to work to the guiding operating principle. Accounting procedures dominate decision-making and financial arguments are used to manipulate political aims (Wilkins, 1994).

The rise of managerialism involves a shift towards a more formalised management structure and control at the institutional level which is reflected in more direct management of the higher education system by the government (Holmes, 1993; Trow, 1993; Miller, 1994).

John Wilkins (1994) argues that higher education is faced with the emergence of unelected oligarchic managerial elites, which wield great power without accountability either externally or internally. The widely publicised events in Britain relating to the vice-chancellors at the universities of Huddersfield and Portsmouth are taken as the tip of an iceberg by proponents of this view.

Externally, provided they balance their books they are unlikely to be challenged. Internally, in the name of 'effective management', senates and academic boards are being stripped of any worthwhile powers and greatly reduced in their breadth of representation. Governing councils provide little effective check. Appointed members owe too much to the patronage of the élite who put them there, while elected representation is reduced. ... I do not deny the possibility of benign oligarchies and dictators. I would prefer not to be forced to rely on it. (Wilkins, 1994)

It is the unelected and unaccountable feature of managerialism and the priority it gives finance that represents the core distinction from collegialism, which emphasises the academic and social.

In Britain, this managerialist tendency first appeared in the former polytechnic sector. Following the incorporation of the then polytechnics there was a centralising of control and an erosion of the contribution of academics to institutional policy-making and 'a sense of alienation from senior management began to manifest itself' (Yorke, 1993, p. 5). It has subsequently spread into the traditional university sector. Managerialism at the level of the state, is manifest in the direct interference in higher education, in the name of accountability, by the government and its agencies such as the funding council (Trow, 1993).

John Rear (1994a, 1994b) disagrees that managerialism is threatening academic freedom. On the contrary, 'good management of the universities is essential as a defence against further erosion of their autonomy. ... For the good of all the academic departments and for the job security of their staff, the universities need to be managed by people who understand and respect academic values but who have not only the time and expertise but the interest to do it well; who do not just see management as a

- regrettable distraction from their real work; and who are willing to immerse themselves in the job and to learn about it' (Rear, 1994a).
- [2] An estimate of the number of higher education institutions that have adopted TQM is difficult on two counts. First the numbers change constantly as new institutions take up the idea and others abandon it. A recent browse on the Internet, for example, revealed that Calgary University is intending to make use of TQM. Second, it depends what is meant by implementing TQM, there is a big difference between making some use of it for student records and applying it across the institution to cover everything including teaching and learning, scholarship, community liaison, and so on.
  - [3] The tendency for unelected bodies to overpower elected forums is, for example, particularly noticeable in some of the new universities in Britain, resulting in high-profile resignations at the universities of Huddersfield and Portsmouth.
  - [4] I am indebted to Selena Mason for this point.

## References

- AGER, D., BARNER, D. & SLEE, P., 1992, 'Organising for quality at Aston University', paper presented at the *Quality by Degrees' Conference*, Aston University, 8 June, 1992.
- AXLAND, S., 1990, 'Looking for a quality education', *Quality Progress*, October, pp. 61-72.
- BALDWIN G., 1994, 'The student as customer: the discourse of 'quality' in higher education', *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, 16, pp. 125-34.
- BARNETT, R., (Ed.), 1994, *Academic Community: discourse or discord?* (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- BARNETT, R., (Ed.), 1992, *Learning to Effect* (Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE)/Open University Press).
- BARNETT, T., 1994, 'Growing a quality culture: a case study of the use of quality management in academic development at Manawatu Polytechnic', in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), 1994, *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10-12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 1, pp. 161-70.
- BAUER, M. & FRANKE-WIKBERG, S., 1993, 'Quality assurance in Swedish higher education: shared responsibility', paper presented at the *First Biennial Conference and General Conference of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education*, Montréal, Canada, 24-28 May.
- BELL, D.R. & SHIEFF, D.S.E., 1990, 'Managing service quality for improved competitive performance: an empirical investigation of contrasting perspectives on service quality in a graduate business school context', *New Zealand Journal of Business*, 12, pp. 1-12.
- BEN-TOVIM, G., GABRIEL, J., LAW, I. & STREDDER, K., 1986, *The Local Politics of Race* (London, Macmillan).
- BINNEY, G 1992, *Making Quality Work: lessons from Europe's leading companies*, Special Report No. P655 (London, The Economist Intelligence Unit).
- BROOKS, T., 1992, 'Total quality management in the NHS', *Health Services Management*, April, pp. 17-19.
- BROWN, R., 1995, 'Quality and standards: the HEQC perspective', in: L. HARVEY, & S. MASON (Eds) *Proceedings of the Third QHE 24-Hour Seminar* (Birmingham, QHE).
- BROWN, S. & KNIGHT, P 1994, *Assessing Learners in Higher Education* (London, Kogan Page).
- BUTCHER, K.S., 1993, 'When TQM goes nowhere', *Training and Development*, January, pp. 22-9.
- CALWAY, B.A. & MURPHY, G.A., 1994, 'Quality audits and ISO9000 accreditation (relevance for a tertiary co-operative undergraduate degree programme), in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10-12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 1, pp. 177-92.
- CAROTHERS, R.L., 1992, 'Trippingly on the tongue: translating quality for the academy', *American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin*, 45(3), November, pp. 6-10.
- CHAFFEE, E.E. & SHERR, L.A., 1992, *Quality: transforming postsecondary education* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3 (Washington, DC, The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development).
- CLAYTON, M., 1992, 'Towards total quality management in higher education: Aston University-a case study', paper presented at the *Centre for Higher Education Studies Seminar on Implementing Total Quality Management in Higher Education*, Institute of Education, London, 3 December.
- CLIFF, A., 1994, 'Measuring quality in New Zealand polytechnics', *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, 16, pp. 45-54.
- COATE, E., 1993, 'The introduction of total quality management at Oregon State University', *Higher Education*, 25, pp. 303-20.

- COATE, L.E., 1990, *Implementing Total Quality Management to a University Setting* (Oregon, Oregon State University).
- COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA, 1991, *Higher Education: quality and diversity in the 1990s*, policy statement by the Hon. Peter Baldwin MP, Minister for Higher Education and Employment Services, October (Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service).
- COULSON-THOMAS, C.J. 1992, 'Surveying the scene', *TQM Magazine*, 4, February, pp. 25–31.
- COWLES, D. & GILBREATH, G., 1992, 'Total quality management at Virginia Commonwealth University: an urban university struggles with the realities of TQM', paper presented at the *Centre for Higher Education Studies Seminar on Implementing Total Quality Management in Higher Education*, Institute of Education, London, 3 December.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (DES), 1991, *Higher Education: a new framework*, White Paper, Cm 1541 (London, HMSO).
- DILL, D., 1992, 'Quality by design: toward a framework for academic quality management' in: J. SMART, (Ed.) *Higher Education: handbook of theory and research*, vol 8, pp. 37–83 (New York, Agathon Press).
- DILL, D., 1995, 'Through Deming's eyes: a cross-national analysis of quality assurance policies in higher education', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1, pp. 95–110.
- DRUCKER, P.F., 1991, 'Don't change corporate culture—use it!', *The Wall Street Journal*, 28 March A14.
- ELTON, L., 1992, 'University teaching: a professional model for quality and excellence', in: R. ELLIS (Ed.) *Quality Assurance for University Teaching*, pp. 133–46 (Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE)/Open University Press).
- ERWIN, T.D. & KNIGHT, P.T., 1995, 'A transatlantic view of assessment and quality in higher education' *Quality in Higher Education*, 1, pp.179–88.
- GARLICK, M., 1994, 'Quality assurance in a seamless institution', in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10–12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 1, pp. 57–66.
- GARVIN, D., 1983, 'Quality on the line', *Harvard Business Review*, 61(5), pp. 65–75.
- GEDDES, T., 1992, 'The total quality initiative at South Bank University', paper presented at the *Centre for Higher Education Studies Seminar on Implementing Total Quality Management in Higher Education*, Institute of Education, London, 3 December.
- GIBBS, G., 1995, 'The relationship between quality in research and quality in teaching', *Quality in Higher Education*, 1, pp. 147–57.
- GITLOW, H.S. & GITLOW, S.J., 1987, *The Deming Guide to Quality and Competitive Position* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall).
- GOODMAN, J.A., BARGATZE, G.P. & GRIMM, C., 1994, 'The key problem with TQM', *Quality Progress*, January, pp. 45–8.
- GRONROOS, C., 1984, 'A service quality model and its marketing implications', *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), pp. 36–44.
- HM GOVERNMENT, 1992, *Further and Higher Education Act* (London, HMSO).
- HABERMAS, J., 1970, *Towards a Rational Society* (Boston, Beacon).
- HALPIN, J., 1966, *Zero Defects: a new dimension in quality assurance* (New York, McGraw Hill).
- HANSEN, W.L., 1993, 'Bringing total quality improvement into the college classroom', *Higher Education*, 25, pp. 259–79.
- HARARI, O., 1993, 'Ten reasons why TQM doesn't work', *Management Review*, January, pp. 33–7.
- HARVEY, L., 1990, *Critical Social Research* (London, Routledge).
- HARVEY, L. (Ed.), 1993a, *Quality Assessment in Higher Education: collected papers of the QHE Project* (Birmingham, QHE).
- HARVEY, L. (Ed.), 1993b, *Proceedings of the QHE Quality Assessment Seminar*, 21–22 January (Birmingham, QHE).
- HARVEY, L., 1994, 'Continuous quality improvement: a system-wide view of quality in higher education', in: P.T. KNIGHT (Ed.) *University-Wide Change, Staff and Curriculum Development*, Staff and Educational Development Association, SEDA Paper, 83, May, pp. 47–70.
- HARVEY, L., 1995, 'The new collegialism', *Tertiary Education and Management*, 1, pp. 153–60.
- HARVEY, L. & GREEN, D., 1993, 'Defining quality', *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 18(1).
- HASELGROVE, S. (Ed.), 1994, *The Student Experience* (Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE)/Open University Press).
- HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY COUNCIL (HEQC), 1994, *Learning from Audit* (London, HEQC).
- HILL, R.C., 1993, 'When the going gets rough: a Baldrige Award winner on the line', *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(3), pp. 75–9.

- HINCHCLIFFE, J., 1994, 'Quality: an alternative perspective', in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10–12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 1, pp. 161–70.
- HOLLOWAY, J., 1993, 'Researching quality management: understanding success', working paper presented at the *British Academy of Management Conference*, Milton Keynes, 20–22 September.
- HOLMES, G., 1993, 'Quality assurance in further and higher education: a sacrificial lamb on the alter of managerialism', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 1(1), p. 4.
- HOLMES, K., 1991, *Total Quality Lessons from Japan*, the report of the Pira-Netmac Study Tour to Japan, September 1990 (Pira International, Leatherhead).
- HUGHES, S., 1994, 'Bedrock of elitism survives reform', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 18 November, p. 10.
- INGLE, S., 1985, *In Search of Perfection: how to create/maintain/improve quality* (Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall).
- JACKSON, J., 1994, 'Total quality management in introductory quantitative subjects', in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10–12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 1, pp. 87–98.
- JOSS, R., KOGAN, M. & HENKEL, M., 1994, *Total Quality Management in the National Health Service: final report of an evaluation* (London, Centre for Evaluation of Public Policy and Practice, Brunel University).
- JURAN, J.M. & GRZYNA, F.M. JR., 1980, *Quality Planning and Analysis*, 2nd edn (New York, McGraw-Hill).
- JURAN, J.M., 1988, *Juran on Planning for Quality* (New York, Free Press).
- KALUZNY, A.D., MCLAUGHLIN, C.P. & JAEGER, B.J., 1993, 'TQM as managerial innovation: research issues and implications', *Health Services Management Research*, 6(2), May, pp. 78–88.
- KNIGHT, P.T. (Ed.), 1995, *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education* (London, Kogan Page).
- LESSEM, R., 1991, *Total Quality Learning* (Oxford, Blackwell).
- LYND, R., 1939, *Knowledge for What?* (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press).
- MARCHESE, T., 1991b, 'TQM reaches the Academy', *American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin*, November, pp. 3–14.
- MARCHESE, T., 1992a, 'TQM at Penn: a report on first experiences. Ted Marchese interviews Penn's TQM champion, Mama C. Whittington', *American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin*, 45(3), November, pp. 3 ff.
- MARCHESE, T., 1992b, 'AAHE and TQM (... make that CQI)', *American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin*, 45(3), November, p. 11.
- MCCONKEY, K., 1994, 'Keepers of the olive grove', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 25 November, p. 15.
- MILLER, H.D.R., 1994, *The Management of Change in Universities: universities, state and economy in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom* (Buckingham, Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press).
- MILLS, C.W., 1959, *Sociological Imagination* (Harmondsworth, Penguin).
- MUFFO, J.A., 1992, 'Benchmarking', *QA* (Newsletter of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher education), No. 2, September, p. 3.
- MÜLLER, D. & FUNNELL, P., 1991, *Delivering Quality in Vocational Education and Training* (London, Kogan Page).
- MÜLLER, D. & FUNNELL, P., 1992, 'Exploring learners' perceptions of quality', paper presented at the *AETT Conference on Quality in Education*, University of York, 6–8 April.
- MÜLLER, D. & FUNNELL, P., 1993, 'Learner perceptions of quality and the learner career', *Quality Assurance in Education*, 1(1), p. 29.
- MYERS, K. & ASHKENAS, R., 1993, 'Results-driven quality', *Executive Excellence*, May, p. 17.
- NATIONAL BOARD OF EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION AND TRAINING HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL (NBEET HEC), 1992, *Higher Education: achieving quality* (Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service).
- NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION (NGA), 1991, *Time For Results: the governors' 1991 report on education* (Washington DC, NGA).
- NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY (NZQA), 1992, *Qualifications for the 21st Century*, conference papers (Wellington, NZQA).
- NEW ZEALAND QUALIFICATIONS AUTHORITY (NZQA), 1994, *Quality Assurance in Education and Training*, conference papers, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10–12 May (Wellington, NZQA).
- NEWBY, T., 1992, *Quality Service Training* (London, Kogan Page).
- NORTH EAST WALES INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION (NEWI), 1994, *Course Team Quality File* (Wrexham, NEWI).
- OAKLAND, J.S., 1990, *Total Quality Management: a practical approach* (London, Department of Trade and Industry).

- PARASURAMAN, A., ZEITHAML, V.A. & BERRY, L.L., 1985, 'A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research', *Journal of Marketing*, 49, pp. 41–50.
- PORTER, D., 1994, 'Case study: an institution responds to the Committee for Quality Assurance in Higher Education' in: P. NIGHTINGALE & M. O'NEIL (Eds) *Achieving Quality Learning in Higher Education* pp. 26–32 (London, Kogan Page).
- PORTER, L.J. & OAKLAND, J.S., 1992, 'Developing the European quality model: the implementation of total quality management at the Management Centre, University of Bradford', paper presented at the AETT Conference on *Quality in Education*, University of York, 6–8 April.
- PRABHU, V. & LEE, P., 1992, 'Total quality management: some experiences and lessons from a higher education institution', paper presented at the AETT Conference on *Quality in Education*, University of York, 6–8 April.
- QUEENSLAND UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY (QUT), 1990, *Faculty of Science TQM Project* (Brisbane, QUT).
- RACE, P., 1993, 'Quality of assessment' in: M. SHAW & E. ROPER (Eds) *Quality in Education and Training: aspects of educational and training technology*, vol. 26, pp. 149–61 (London, Kogan Page).
- RAMASESHAN, B. & PITT, L.F., 1990, 'Service quality measurement approaches and the assessment of management education quality', *ANZAME Proceedings*, pp. 513–21.
- REAR, J., 1994a, 'Defenders of academic faith', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 21 October, p. 15.
- REAR, J., 1994b, 'Freedom with responsibility', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 December, p. 12.
- ROBERTS, H., 1990, 'Performance and outcome measures in the Health Service', in: M. CAVE, M. KOGAN & R. SMITH (Eds) *Output and Performance Measurement in Government: the state of the art*, pp. 60–85 (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- ROPER, R., 1993, 'Quality in course design: empowering students through course processes and structures in a professional development scheme', in: M. SHAW & E. ROPER (Eds) *Quality in Education and Training: aspects of educational and training technology*, vol. 26, pp. 107–13 (London, Kogan Page).
- SANDERS, C., 1994, 'History group slams council', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 25 November, p. 3.
- SARAPH, J.V., BENSON, P.G. & SCHROEDER, R.G., 1989, 'An instrument for measuring the critical factors of quality management', *Decision Sciences Journal*, 20, pp. 810–29.
- SCHOFIELD, A., SHEAFF, R., WELLSTEAD, L. & YOUNG, E., 1991, Report for the NHSTA on Total Quality Management, Health Services Management Unit, University of Manchester.
- SEYMOUR, D.T. & COLLETT, C., 1991, *GOAL/QPC 1991 Application Report No. 91-01* (Methuen, MA, GOAL/QPC).
- SEYMOUR, D.T., 1991, 'TQM on campus: what the pioneers are finding', *American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) Bulletin*, 44(3).
- SEYMOUR, D.T., 1992, *On Q: causing quality in higher education* (New York, American Council on Education/Macmillan).
- SOUTH BANK UNIVERSITY, 1992, *Customer-Supplier Working Groups Workbook* (London, South Bank University).
- SPANBAUER, S.J., 1987, *Quality First in Education. ... Why Not?* (Appleton, WIS, Fox Valley Technical College).
- STEVENSON, A. & DONNELLY, M., 1994, 'TQM: panacea or placebo?', paper presented at the 16th EAIR Forum, Amsterdam, 21–24 August.
- TANNOCK, J.D.T., 1991, Letter in the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 2 August, p. 12.
- TIMES HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPLEMENT (THES), 1994, Editorial, 'Quality and equity puzzle', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 14 October, p. 9.
- TROW, M., 1993, 'Managerialism and the academic profession: the case of England', paper presented to the 'Quality Debate', sponsored by the *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 24 September 1993.
- TURNER, A., 1993, Total quality management in education, MSc project in Advanced Manufacturing Technology, University of Portsmouth, School of Systems Engineering, January.
- VAN VUGHT, F.A., 1991, 'Higher education quality assessment in Europe: the next step', *CRE-action*, 96(4), pp. 61–82 (originally Publication No. 107 in the series Higher Education Policy Studies, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies, University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands).
- VROEIJENSTIJN, A.I., 1994, *Improvement and Accountability: navigating between Scylla and Charybdis* (London, Jessica Kingsley).
- WALLEY, P., 1992, *Total Quality, BS5750 or What? Quality techniques for H.E. teaching* (Loughborough, Loughborough University, Management Research Series, paper number 1992:6).
- WARREN PIPER, D., 1993, *Quality Management in Universities*, vol. 1. Department of Employment, Education and Training, Higher Education Division, Evaluations and Investigation Program (Canberra, Australian Government Publishing Service).
- WARREN PIPER, W.D., 1994, *Are Professors Professional? The organisations of university examinations* (London, Jessica Kingsley).

- WESTERHEIJDEN, D. F., BRENNAN, J. & MAASSEN, P.A.M., 1994, *Changing Contexts of Quality Assessment, Recent Trends in Western European Higher Education* (Utrecht, Lemma).
- WILKINS, J., 1994, 'Letter to the Editor', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 28 October.
- WILLIAMS, G., 1993, 'Total quality management in higher education: panacea or placebo?', *Higher Education*, 25, pp. 229-37.
- WOJTAS, O., 1994, 'Elite group defend role', *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 16 December, p. 3.
- WOODHOUSE, D., 1994, 'TQM in HE: A Sceptical View', in: New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) *Quality Assurance in Education and Training: conference papers*, 3 vols for a Conference held in Wellington, 10-12 May. Wellington, NZQA, vol. 2, pp. 25-8.
- YORKE, M., 1993, 'Total quality higher education?', paper at the 15th EAIR Forum, University of Turku, 15 August.
- ZAIRI, M., 1992, *Quality Function Deployment: a modern competitive tool*, executive summary for the EFQM UK Membership. Based on a full report by M. ZAIRI, University of Bradford.
- ZEITHAML, V.A., PARASURAMAN, A. & BERRY, L.L., 1990, *Delivering Quality Service* (New York, Free Press).