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Why Aren’t Staff More Mobile?

• Management won’t let the staff go
• The staff don’t want to go
• It’s for young, single people only
• It’s for junior staff at the start of their careers
• It’s for academic staff only

WRONG!

• Assumptions have filled the knowledge gap
• Assumptions are hampering implementation
Contents

• Context
  – Managing Universities in the UK
  – The Knowing-Doing Gap of Strategy Execution
  – Internationalisation Continua

• The Vicious Circle of Strategy Failure

• Emerging Themes from the Research
  – Culture
  – Strategy
  – Entrepreneurship
  – Diversity

• The Virtuous Circle of Strategy Execution

• Three New Models
Some Context

• Universities as ‘unique’ organisations (Grigg, 1994)
• New focus on academic entrepreneurship + hostile reception (Tasker & Packham, 1990; Grigg, 1994)
• ‘New managerialism’ and erosion of ‘academic freedom’ (Clarke & Newman, 1994; Deem, 1998, 2001)
• Internationalisation as a 21st century imperative for HE institutions (Horn et al., 2007)
• Common failure to execute strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2008)
• Vague statements re ‘encouragement’ & ‘facilitation’ of staff mobility (Harris, 2008; Killick, 2007)
Managing Universities

- ‘Organised anarchies’ (March & Olsen, 1976)
- ‘Professional bureaucracies’ (Mintzberg, 1979)
- ‘Machine bureaucracies’?
- Lack of strategic experience and expertise
- Increasingly turbulent, international environment
- Multiple constituencies & stakeholders (Schmidtlein & Milton, 1989)
- Multiple and unclear, disputed, changing values & aims (Williams, 1995)
- Political scrutiny: constrained autonomy
- Decreasing public funding & accountability: transitional state (Liu & Dubinsky, 2000)
- Emergent, learning strategy only (Mintzberg et al., 1998)
- “Reactor/Adapting” organisations (no clear strategy, no freedom) (Burgelman, 1983)
- Strong culture is particularly important, includes strong values (Sporn, 1996)
- Convergence of issues/challenges for ‘old’ & ‘new’ universities (Deem, 1998)
The Knowing-Doing Gap
(Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000)

• 66% of corporate strategy is never executed (Johnson, 2004)
• 60-80% fall short of their strategy predictions (Kaplan & Norton, 2008)
• Only 60% potential value is realised due to “defects and breakdowns” in execution (Mankins & Steele, 2005)
• 85% exec teams spend less than 1 hour pcm discussing strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2005)
• Gap between promises and delivery (various authors)
• Rhetoric-Reality Gap in HE internationalisation (Otter, 2007)
• Execution more difficult than formulation (Carpenter & Sanders, 2007; Hrebiniak, 2006)
• Makes the difference between competitors (Bossidy & Charan, 2002)
• It’s not poor strategy, it’s poor execution!
• Beware “performance ambiguity”: attributing failure to the wrong thing (Hill, 2009)
• Gresham’s Law: discussions about bad operations inevitably drive out discussions about good strategy implementation (Kaplan & Norton, 2008)
Internationalisation Continua

Based on Turner & Robson, 2007; Jones & Brown, 2007; Bartell, 2003; Schoorman, 2000; Mestenhauser, 1998

INFUSION APPROACH
(deVita & Case, 2003)

Symbolic
Compliant
Commercial
Competitive

Transformative
Committed
Internationalist
Co-operative

HOLISTIC, VALUES-BASED APPROACH
(various)
A Vicious Circle

New Managerialism

Wrong implementation levers pulled

Compliance with an Infusion Approach

Planned approach to strategy

Performance ambiguity & assumptions

Failure to execute strategy

Bureaucracy stifles AF and entrepreneurship

TENSION with VALUES?
Pragmatic Insider Action Research

1st/2nd/3rd Person, “Outsider Within”

Cycle 1: Investigate Inside  
Cycle 2: Explore Outside  
Cycle 3: Negotiate  
Cycle 4: Plan  
Cycle 5: Go  
Cycle 6: Come Back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
<th>Cycle 5</th>
<th>Cycle 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Emerging Themes

• Danger of Assumptions
• Culture
• Work-Family Separation
• Absence of Strategy
• Absence of Architecture
• Flexibility
• Value of Entrepreneurial Individuals
• The Problem with Strategic Entrepreneurs
• Communication Breakdown
• The Dual Approach
Relevant Elements of Culture

- Nostalgia & blame
  - (due to transition state? Liu & Dubinsky, 2000)
- Support and enthusiasm
- Fire-fighting & muddling-through (Lindblom, 1959; Bartell, 2003)
- Reliance on tacit knowledge (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000)
- Bilingualism (Gewirtz et al., 2005)
- Internal focus (Sporn, 1996)
- New managerialism & bureaucracy (C&F, Deem)
- Importance of ‘values’ & ‘philosophy’ (Tierney, 1988; Teichler, 2004; Robson & Turner)
- Academic freedom as “pure” entrepreneurialism?
‘Pure’ entrepreneurship

- In HE, negative attitude towards entrepreneurialism or entrepreneurship, based on
  - a narrow, superficial understanding of the concept (e.g. ‘academic entrepreneurship’)
  - a confusion with commercialism (e.g. in Deem, 2001)
  - an unproven (and contradictory) equation with ‘new managerialism’ (e.g. in Vaira, 2004, Turner & Robson, 2007)
  - and therefore globalisation (e.g. in Slaughter & Leslie, 1997)
  - related prejudice against ‘a business ethos’ (Vaira, 2004)
- original definition of entrepreneurship as “the doing of new things or the doing of things that are already being done in a new way” (Schumpeter, 1947)
- and others which emphasise autonomy and flexibility (e.g. Timmons et al., 1985)
- entrepreneurial values (Hayton, 2005; Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004; Morris & Jones, 1999)
Work-Family Separation

- Irresponsible & unrealistic: erects huge barrier
- Especially foolish in staff mobility
- “Young, single people” have relationships too!
- Family as motivator
- Family as facilitator
- Family as contributor
- Family as supporter
Absence of Strategy

• No strategy, no vision, no strategic consensus, no shared values
• Opportunistic operations, management wish list (Bossidy & Charan, 2002) collaborator drag (Howe & Martin, 1998)
• Discussion of an “agenda” (rolling list of things ‘to do’)
• Reliance on muddling-through (Bartell, 2003) but NOT fire-fighting (no urgency)
• Piecemeal & expedient implementation
• No communication on staff mobility
• Entrepreneurs seek ‘hooks’ on which to hang projects (creating unnecessary complexity): pet projects
• No incentive or reward for implementers
• Undermines institutional benefits
Absence of Architecture

- Piggy-backing process and diverting existing resources = entrepreneurial behaviour (Burgelman, 1983, Herr & Anderson, 2005)
- Building structure as you go
- Incentives & rewards are remote, indirect and uncertain
- Unnecessarily time-consuming, risky, difficult, complex
- Relying on special skills, experience and access
- All barriers to wider participation in mobility
- Potential failure undermines institution
- Learning is lost
Need for Flexibility

• Conceptual
  – Anytime, anyplace, anywhere
  – Anyone!
    • especially more mature, senior staff with families (for greater institution benefits)
    • Including admin and support staff
  – Avoid direct, like-for-like exchanges

• Personal
  – entrepreneurial behaviours, not personal circumstances!

• Organisational
  – Slack
## Generic Situations of Entrepreneurship in Large, Complex Organisations

(Burgelman 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slack Available at Operational Level</th>
<th>Top Management’s Perception of the Opportunity Cost Of Current Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Low                                 | Top management does not want, and operational participants do not provide, many entrepreneurial projects.  
**Result:** Minimum emphasis on autonomous strategic behaviour loop. |
| High                                | Top management wants, but operational participants do not provide, many entrepreneurial projects.  
**Result:** Force the autonomous strategic behaviour loop. Jump into just any projects available. Projects end up as “failures.” |
| Low                                 | Top management does not want, but operational participants do provide many entrepreneurial projects.  
**Result:** Suppression of the autonomous strategic behaviour loop. New projects end up as “orphans” or “misfits.” |
| High                                | Top management wants, and operational participants provide, many entrepreneurial projects.  
**Result:** Maximum emphasis on the autonomous strategic behaviour loop. |
Value of the Entrepreneurial Individual

- Autonomous strategic behaviour (Burgelman, 1983)
- Externally-focused, self-interested, values-driven
- Creates an ‘eco-system of collective interest’ (ie new culture) (Burgelman & Hitt, 2007)
- Uses dyadic communication & personal relationships (Hutt et al., 1988)
- Fill the strategy vacuum with dedication, determination, perseverance (Timmons et al., 1985) passion, resolution in pursuing dreams (Thornberry, 2001)
- The Power of Gatekeepers: judgement or assumptions?
Value of Entrepreneurial Individual

The Attitudinal Rollercoaster

Time Passing: Cycle Numbers

1  2  3  4  5  6
The Problem with Relying on Strategic Entrepreneurs

• Exploited by the institution: little support and no reward “working 18 hrs a day” (Thornberry, 2001)

• Runs personal risk, creates organisational risk: no contingencies, no ‘anticipatory management’ (Porter & Harper, 2003)

• ‘Strategic neglect’ (Burgelman, 1983) means limited ability to institutionalise
  – Avoids bureaucracy, plays down challenges, ignores barriers, details “il n’y a pas de soucis”

• Therefore provides little ‘demonstration effect’ (Binks & Lumsdaine, 2003)
Communication Breakdown

• University - partners
• School - Centre
• Committee Secrecy
• Personal
  – Between individual and partners
  – Between individual and home institution
Diversity & The Creative Class

**DIVERSITY**
- enables organisations to survive (Burgelman, 1983)
- drives entrepreneurialism, innovation, creativity (various)
- provides greater capacity for transformation (Greenwood & Levin, 2007)
- Lack of innovation due to lack of diversity in faculty (deVita & Case, 2003)
- attracts entrepreneurial individuals as members of the Creative Class (Florida, 2004)
- those using creativity in education are also members of the this Class (ibid)
- a university is a potential creative hub (not just for academic entrepreneurship) (ibid)

**DIVERSITY**
- Diversity measures include numbers of “foreigners” and racial integration (ibid)
- internationalisation drives diversity (Horn et al., 2007)
- drives internationalisation (Bartell, 2003)
- **values**-driven approach promotes and develops diversity (Brown & Jones, 2007)
- internationalisation can be conceptualised as an inclusive culture in which diversity is celebrated (Robson & Turner, 2007)
- some HE systems value it (Welch, 2002)
A Virtuous Circle?

VALUES for:
- strategy execution
- internationalisation
- diversity & entrepreneurship

- Umbrella: Holistic Int
- Slack & Flexibility
- Diversity
- Attracts the Creative Class
- Autonomous Strategic Behaviour
- Staff Mobility
- Learning Culture
- Demonstration Effect
The Dual Approach

Burgelman’s Reinterpretation of Miles & Snow and Mintzberg Typologies Applied to the Dual Approach to International Staff Exchanges
## Dual Qualities of International Staff Exchange

developed from Inkson et al.'s Contrasting Qualities of Expatriate Assignment (1997, p.352).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expat Assignment</th>
<th>University Staff Exchange</th>
<th>Overseas Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation:</strong></td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Dual Approach</td>
<td>Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals:</strong></td>
<td>Company projects</td>
<td>University and individual aims</td>
<td>Individual development (diffuse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(specific)</td>
<td>(combined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding:</strong></td>
<td>Company salary &amp; expenses</td>
<td>Company salary &amp; expenses / Individual contribution</td>
<td>Personal savings &amp; casual earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career Type:</strong></td>
<td>Organizational career</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>Boundaryless career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Lit:</strong></td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Bridge Across the Knowing-Doing Gap: New Model for Staff Mobility
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