Critical Perspectives on Accounting (2002) **13,** 603–619
doi:10.1006/cpac.2002.0561
Available online at http://www.idealibrary.com on IDEAL®

IT'S BEEN A PLEASURE DOING BUSINESS WITH YOU: A STRATEGIC ANALYSIS AND CRITIQUE OF UNIVERSITY CHANGE MANAGEMENT

LEE D. PARKER

School of Commerce, Adelaide University, Australia

Universities have been undergoing major changes in scope of activities, structures, processes and relationships since late in the 20th century. This paper critically examines some of the dimensions of these changes, reflecting on the spectrum of environmental forces and internal resource pressures that have begun to transform many aspects of university governance core activities, stakeholder relationships and academic work. This Habermasian informed analysis and critique of major changes in university operations, reveals an array of globalised environmental disturbances that have directly impacted on university design archetypes including governance, accountability, decision-making and communication. The consequent impacts on the financial, educational and research subsystems are found to be extensive and have penetrated the interpretive schemes that constitute the university lifeworld. Commercial values are found to be usurping the previously dominant knowledge focussed values in universities. A re-engagement in discourse and bottom-up strategic management and processually based change orientation are offered as potential foundations for developing a bridge between the new managerialism and academics' re-empowerment.

Universities in many western democracies have undergone a sea change in their strategic focus, core values, and *modus operandi* in the last 20 or so years. In adapting to and enacting these changes, they have sought to survive through a considerable variety of strategies that have involved prioritization of revenue generation, resources reallocation, management professionalization, organizational restructuring and strategic relationships with government and business. This paper examines and critiques these changes from a Habermasian informed perspective and offers a strategic processual basis for academics' engagement in change discourse and management.

Address for correspondence: University of Adelaide, Faculty of Econ & Commerce, Department of Commerce, 233 North Terrace, Adelaide 5005, Australia. E-mail: lparker@economics.adelaide.edu.au
Received 12 January 2001; accepted 12 December 2001

1045–2354/02/$ - see front matter

In the face of major organization structure and process change, the temptation of entrenched academics is invariably to reflect on the loss of their treasured past and often quite justifiably to deliver searing critiques of the contemporary educational and research failures of the contemporary university system. Such critiques have neither perceptibly influenced the pace and direction of university change. This paper offers a reflective structured critique of the changes witnessed in contemporary universities and present elementary perspectives on how academics themselves might begin to reclaim a change management role within the universities they inhabit.

The paper first briefly summarises a Habermasian perspective of organizational change. It then reviews the changing external environment impacting on universities, including major external environmental shocks, funding changes and the simultaneous globalization of business and education. Internal design archetype changes with particular regard to university governance are subsequently considered and the flow-on impact upon the university subsystems of finance, education and research are considered. The consequent impact upon the university lifeworld is then analysed and a strategic change management approach to regaining some degree of academic participation and engagement in strategy formulation and change are then proffered.

Habermasian Change Diagnosis

Laughlin (1991) has offered the best developed Habermasian interpretation of organizational change processes and the alternative shapes and paths that they may take. This interpretation has been further explicated by Broadbent and Laughlin (1997, 1998). Organizations react to external disturbances or shocks by seeking to re-establish a new equilibrium point via one of two major pathways, typified as first- or second-order change. These two change pathways are differentiated in terms of the route they exhibit through three dimensions of an organization—its interpretive schemes (or lifeworld), its design archetypes (or steering media) and its subsystems (or systems). Its interpretive schemes represent the organization's mission, core values and its accumulated views of its world, itself and its social relations—in other words, the organizational culture. Its subsystems are the organization's tangible elements, such as buildings, people, machines, finance and their interactions. Its design archetypes are the organization structures, decision processes and communication systems designed by the organization to ensure that the systems reflect and express the organization's interpretive schemes.

According to this Habermasian perspective, a disturbance can potentially impact on an organization in a number of ways. First-order (morphostatic) change will be experienced when the organization adapts to the disturbance by either rebutting the disturbance altogether or reorienting to some degree. This is classified as a first-order change process. It involves changes to the design archetype and invariably the systems, while leaving the interpretive schemes unaffected. Rebuttal occurs when the design archetype changes to cope with the disturbance, but protects the systems and the interpretive schemes from any change, and indeed may

subsequently revert to its former state once the disturbance has been rebutted. Reorientation occurs when some greater degree of organizational adaptation to the disturbance is required in the form of changes both to design archetype and systems. The environmental disturbance is thus accepted and internalised into the organization's daily operations. Nevertheless, the interpretive schemes are still protected from any change.

Second-order (morphogenetic) change is a deeper degree of organizational change and will be experienced when the interpretive schemes of the organization are changed. This can happen in one of two ways. The disturbance may be addressed directly and discursively by organizational members who agree upon consequent changes to their interpretive schemes. This is known as evolutionary change, and is considered to be a more desirable route. Alternatively, the disturbance may be more pathological, and through the agency of small groups of organization members or other stakeholders it may impact directly upon the design archetypes which being changed, then force changes in the organization's interpretive schemes to a profound and lasting degree. This forced change to the interpretive schemes is termed "colonization".

Thus change within organizations can be diagnosed as conforming to one or more of these four pathways—first-order change taking the form of rebuttal or reorientation, or second-order change taking the form of evolution or colonization. They reflect greater and lesser degrees of impact of external disturbances upon an organization's interpretive schemes and where change does impact upon the interpretive schemes, they reflect the paths of voluntary agreement and coercion. These provide a useful framework for critically assessing contemporary change in the university sector.

A World of Change

Over the past decade in particular, a veritable wave of environmental shocks have been impacting on universities. These have included the internationalisation and globalisation of business, a phenomenon encompassing both large and small to medium sized organizations (Deresky, 1997; Valls, 1998). Organizational structures have expanded to include matrix and network configurations and product and service delivery structures have increasingly embraced various configurations of joint ventures and strategic alliances. The virtual organization has become increasingly evident. The knowledge based economy has been articulated and pursued through the growth of the service sector, the identification of human resources and their expertise as a commodity offering strategic advantage, and the facilitation of their exploitation through information technology (Burns & Yazfidar, 2001). Product and service consumers have become better educated and more discriminating, choice has expanded exponentially and consumer decision-making information availability has proliferated and accelerated (Parker, 2001). Quality and accountability have become focal issues in private and public and not-for-profit sectors. Total quality management and continuous improvement philosophies have been advocated at both operational and marketing levels. Accountability has been

defined and redefined, with emerging tensions between internal—organizational accountability (between hierarchical levels of authority) and external organizational accountability (to stakeholders, government, community) (Guthrie & Parker, 1993; Gould & Parket, 1999). Governments have uncritically adopted and pursued philosophies of user-pays, commercialisation, corporatisation and privatisation of public sector functions, enterprises and services (Guthrie & Parker, 1998).

Universities have directly reacted to these external disturbances. We have witnessed considerable growth in the number of undergraduate and postgraduate student enrolments as governments drive for wider community access to tertiary education and universities seek additional student fee revenues. Simultaneous pressures are exerted for greater variety of degree and subject offerings, duplicated programmes offered on-site in multiple geographic locations, technology-based distance learning delivery, larger classes and more cost-efficient teaching, detailed reporting systems for measurable teaching and research output accountability, research grant revenues and proliferating fee-for-service teaching programmes. In attempting to cope with these simultaneous and conflicting pressures, universities have opted for the streamlined planning and control of operations and finances via a private sector based managerial class. In many universities, these professional university managers have co-opted to a considerable degree, decision-making formerly carried out by collegial committees.

University vice-chancellors and principals have typically restructured their domains into a smaller number of large-scale faculties or divisions, in pursuit of a smaller number accountable strategic business units (SBUs), and a small number of senior managers accountable to them. Senior management in the form of faculty or division deans, and specialist pro or deputy vice chancellors (charged with functions such as international programmes, industry linkages, research and general academic programmes) invariably form the new (senior executive) core of the policy and strategy shaping group. They hold considerable personal power in the university hierarchy of authority, exercising control over many committees and having considerable scope of personal decision-making power. Accountability has increasingly moved from a focus upon mutual accountability between academic committees, to one of committee and individual accountability to the senior executive. Communications tend increasingly to flow top–down within the university hierarchy, as decisions are increasingly formulated at top management levels and then passed down for comment or implementation to the “line” academics.

These macro observations concerning environmental impacts on universities prompt a cautionary question. How new is all this? How unique and without precedent are these changes we have witnessed in the past 10–20 years? Tilling’s (2001) exploratory paper on the history of universities in the Industrial Revolution suggests that at least some of the environmental pressures upon universities and their reactions to those, do have parallels in earlier time periods. If this is the case, there may be lessons to be learned, if only from the point of view that better understanding ourselves and our past may help us to better understand the foundations, dimensions and possibilities of our present (Parker, 1999). For this reason, we need further research into the history of universities and their environmental interactions.

The Funding Crunch

Particularly over the past 10 years, many western governments have reduced their overall levels of funding to universities in real terms, both in recurrent funding of teaching, research funding and funding of infrastructure and other capital expenditure. In Australia for example, a recent Federal Senate inquiry into the funding and quality of Australia's publicly funded universities found that in the last decade of the 20th century, student numbers in the total university system had increased by 70 percent, while academic staff numbers had remained unchanged, and teaching loads had effectively doubled (Gale, 2001a; Senate Committee, 2001). Funding restrictions have forced many small sized universities to enter the world of mass student education for which they have inadequate infrastructure and resources. For the same reasons, larger universities have been forced to adopt larger class sizes, lower cost contract teaching arrangements, and lower quality student intakes for fee generation. University cost cutting and rationalization has included postponement or elimination of building and maintenance programmes, outsourcing of internal security and computer services, restrictions upon borrowings, shifting of infrastructure service and cost responsibilities from central university administration to faculties and schools, department closures and staff redundancies. The order of the day has also become revenue generation—through international student recruitment, international courseware delivery, joint research projects with industry, commercialisation of research outputs, corporate consultancies, corporate in-house training programmes, short course delivery to industry and commerce, and strategic alliances with professional and business bodies in providing postgraduate professional qualifying education (Caruana *et al.*, 1998; Warwick, 1999; Sharma, 2001).

Through revenue generating strategies, "government—funded" universities now earn up to 50% of their total revenue from non-government sources. Those building programmes that can be undertaken are increasingly funded by philanthropic donations, corporate sponsorship or cross subsidisation from revenue earning arms of the university. Equipment and other physical assets are often forced into longer working lives despite technological obsolescence of physical deterioration. Faculty level administrative and academic staffing has invariably atrophied, resulting in increasing student–staff ratios, cohorts of part-time teachers, lesser advice and other services provided to students and so on. Thus in response to external environmental pressures, professional managers undertake the internally inconsistent exercise of attempting to extract both cost savings and increased revenue out of a static or shrinking set of resources.

The Global Business of Education

In reflecting global trends in business, universities have exhibited tendencies towards homogenized education and research profiles that to increasing degrees fit a North American model. While professional university managers may aim for distinctive competencies and differentiation strategies, they are subject to common international pressures and an obsession with benchmarking that mould them

into common educations profiles which Marginson (1999, 2000) terms “global convergence”. This tendency is accentuated by their generally commonly adopted strategy of becoming what Considine and Marginson (2001) call “enterprise universities” which operate in both the public and private sectors and which try to mix traditional academic with business practices, In doing so, they may risk becoming poor imitators of a mythical global university model, rather than developing their own unique national profiles or alternative, innovative international models.

Contiguous with governments’ real reduction in funding to universities, the education marketplace has deregulated and expanded at a dramatic rate. This has arguably transformed universities into highly entrepreneurial, customer focussed and revenue seeking enterprises (Acroyd & Ackroyd, 1999). The scope and nature of university activities, operations and services provided now include internationalized curricula and student exchanges, globalised distance learning programmes, multiple offshore campuses, international collaborations between universities, co-operative university–industry research centres, joint and double degrees, franchises and in-house corporate training and certification programmes (Wilmoth, 1998; Inayatullah, 1999; Pratt & Poole, 1999, 2000; Prince & Stewart, 2000; Stevens, 2000; Manning, 2001).

Along with the corporatization of universities has come the emerging phenomenon of the corporate university which can take various forms ranging from a rebadged corporate training department, to a centralized training and development service to multiple organizations, to a joint venture between a corporation and a “traditional” university. The campus may be physical or it may be a virtual web-based corporate university. Training, education and development services ranging from front line employee job skills to MBA programmes, can be provided to a full spectrum of consumers including corporate employees, suppliers, distributors and dealers (Moore, 1997; Peak, 1997; Sunoo, 1998; Meister, 1998; Anonymous, 1999, 2000a,b; Arkin, 2000; Dillich, 2000; Gerbman, 2000).

Universities themselves have also demonstrated a preparedness to enter partnerships with business. These have included university training centres for industry (including joint venture corporate universities); corporate and professional firm involvement in university undergraduate, executive development and short course delivery; jointly funded and operated research centres; outsourced university functions such as human resource management, computing and accounting systems; and joint venture consulting operations (Wallace & Ipson, 1992; Bell, 1996; Clarke, 1999; Mavin & Bryans, 2000; Yaisn *et al.*, 2000).

So in response to global external environment pressures, universities have dramatically adjusted their activities and profiles. Marginson’s (1999, 2000) typifying them as globally converging largely results from universities’ perceived need to “do it all” as they struggle with the ever present threat of further real reductions in government funding, volatile international student markets, income source diversification, cost reduction and deficit avoidance (Baty, 2001). This further predisposes them towards similar missions, broadly similar profiles and mutual imitation (Marginson, 2001). So in a global and increasingly homogeneous marketplace, universities behave as “information entrepreneurs. Once a place apart, they are now intensely worldly” (MacIntyre, 2001, p. 5).

A New Interior World

University design archetypes have directly reacted and changed in an attempt to deal with the deregulation and reduced funding of universities and the global pressures to "do educational business". Vice Chancellors and university principals have increasingly assumed the roles and powers of corporate CEOs. They have appointed senior executives in specialist roles such as pro/deputy vice chancellor/principal (education), (international), (academic), (research), (industry) and so on. Faculties and divisons have been amalgamated (often in ill-fitting coalitions of former schools/faculties/division) in order to decrease the span of senior executive control. Accountability to the senior executive group has increasingly supplanted accountability to university council or senate, and communication channels have increasingly favoured a top-down emphasis. Collegial management by committee has given way to professionalized management by executive. Whereas administrators were formerly answerable to academics on management committees, now academics have increasingly become answerable to professional executive managers (Allen & Newcomb, 1999; Stevens, 2000; Boden, 2001). Predominantly tenured academics have given way to a predominance of contract, casual and part-time lecturers and researchers. Functional subunits such as marketing, alumni relations, international programmes and research have invariably been developed and empowered to pursue each university's revenue raising objectives.

Thus university governance structures and processes have been particularly prominent among the design archetype impacts of environmental changes. University management by layers of academic committees have traditionally exhibited problematical features such as slow decision-making and prevarication, unclear lines of responsibility and accountability, resistance to change, protection of established power groupings, resourcing inequities and limited uptake of new strategic opportunities (Kay, 2000). This collegial system of governance was slow, prone to rigidity and often simply preserved the status quo. The professionalised managerial system of university governance, imported form the private sector, offered the prospect of a faster, more flexible decision-making process that could break through inherited and decaying university power structures and resource abuses. However, it has brought with it design archetype features such as a structural appearance of decentralizing functions and control down to faculties and divisions, while in fact installing a centralised system of senior executive operational and resource control. Decision-making has become driven more by senior executive command, strategic initiatives have been imposed upon faculties and divisions, and despite rhetoric to the contrary, revenue generation has been derived from school level activity while a large proportion of resulting revenue inflows have been diverted to strategies, subunits and projects directly controlled by the senior executive. With their centralised control and its proliferating strategic initiatives, these executive leaders often become overwhelmed by their workload and disconnected from the academic and administrative community they supposedly lead (Acroyd & Ackroyd, 1999; Duke, 2000; Considine & Marginson, 2001).

This has posed a number of dilemmas. The relationship between vice chancellor/principal and university council/senate has become complex and fraught with

uncertainty as the former appears to take more unfettered strategic control of the organization, moving the latter more into a house of review role. Just as university autonomy from outside forces and organizations has declined, so has autonomy within the university, with for example some universities even enacting regulations to restrict freedom of speech amongst employed academics. The supposedly streamlined "modern" corporate approach to management now being employed within universities has often reverted to a simplistic classical management approach relying upon authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction and centralization (Fayol, 1949). A real tension has been created between the need for universities to strategically position themselves for survival in a highly competitive environment and the need for them to preserve space for inquiry and critique (the very foundations of their "distinctive competence" and "competitive advantage").

So in response to external environmental disturbances impacting on universities, a range of their design archetypes have changed in response—management identities, organization structures, decision-making and communication processes. The question that now must be addressed is whether those changes have gone further than the design archetypes. Have the design archetypes changed but protected the systems and interpretive schemes from the external disturbances, thereby achieving rebuttal of the impacts? The answer would appear to be "no". This can be demonstrated by first considering the observed impact on the university's own funding subsystem, education subsystem and research subsystem.

The Big Three Impacts

Within each university, multiple subsystems exist, among which the funding, education and research subsystems are particularly prominent. These are the "big three" which have been directly affected by environmental disturbances and indirectly affected by university design archetype changes in response to those disturbances. A brief review of those subsystem impacts and changes is appropriate.

First, as already pointed out with respect to "funding crunch", the individual university financial subsystem has become increasingly stressed as governments have reduced their funding levels in real terms. Alternative sources of revenue and cost reduction strategies have become the order of the day. Revenues are pursued through fee paying international student recruitment, offshore teaching of programmes industry partnering in research and consultancies. Physical asset degradation and obsolescence, inadequate technical infrastructure, casualized labour and outsourced services (from security to cleaning) have become increasingly apparent. Operating costs are lowered via large classes and contract teaching. Library collections are denuded and student and staff support services are wound back. Responsibility for administrative tasks are increasingly shifted from university central administration without the commensurate funding and faculty budget target for revenue generation and cost incurrence are progressively tightened (Ping, 1981; CCST, 1998; Coy & Pratt, 1998; Bolton, 2001; Churchman, 2001; Marginson, 2001; Sharma, 2001).

Second, the educational subsystem has experienced quite profound changes as it attempts to cope with simultaneous pressures for both cost reduction and revenue generation. Integral to the changes in the financial subsystem just discussed, have been expansion of education activities into delivery of educational programmes offshore via overseas partners and offshore campuses, the expansion of distance learning programmes, the delivery of professional qualifying and development education for professional associations, corporate in house certification programmes and delivery of corporate training. Specialized vocational and market oriented degrees have been proliferated in the competition for student enrolments. Programmes and subjects have been increasingly subject to scrutiny with respect to enrolment viability and student pass rates. Teachers have almost universally been subject to measurement of teaching delivery by student survey assessment. Pressures have also mounted for additional teaching terms to be included in the academic year. The focus has increasingly shifted to developing and marketing academic programmes that appeal to both undergraduate, postgraduate and short course markets with a view to expanding the revenue base and meeting enrolment targets (Warwick, 1999; Pratt & Poole, 1999–2000; Prince & Stewart, 2000; Gale, 2001b; Manning, 2001).

Third, the research subsystem has also experienced significant change, particularly in response to restricted availability of funds, governmental pressures for applied research that yields tangible short-term dividends and government imposed research performance measurement systems such as the Research Assessment Exercise in the UK and the Department of Employment, Training and Youth Affairs publication points system in Australia. Research has become measured and funded by government in terms of previous research grants won, number and rate of postgraduate student degree completions and quantum of published output. The winning of research grants becomes an end in itself as universities' and academics' research reputations and grant/position/rank winning potential is directly impacted. The quantum of work published has increased through increasing the number and percentage of academics publishing and/or increasing individual academic publishing rates per annum in response to pressures upon academics and their departments to increase the amount of research funding awarded by government. Government research funding inducements have also led university management to pressure academics to engage in collaborate research with industry (CCST, 1998; Wilmoth, 1998; Warwick, 1999; Pratt & Poole, 1999, 2000; Neumann & Guthrie, 2001).

From the above observations it is clear that in general, university subsystems have indeed changed in response to tertiary educational environmental disturbances. These change have occurred both directly in response to such disturbances as well as in response to changes in university design design archetypes that have appeared as adaptive responses to external environmental change. This suggests at the very least that a significant university reorientation has occurred. The outstanding question remaining to be addressed is whether the change goes deeper. Can signs of second-order morphogenetic changes be detected in the form of changes to the interpretive schemes that constitute the governing life world of these institutions?

A Mutating Culture

Signs of significant impact of design archetype and subsystem changes can indeed be detected in the interpretive schemes that make up the organizational culture and lifeworld of contemporary universities. The earlier referred to Australian Federal parliamentary Senate committee investigation into universities, reported on the advent of the entrepreneurial university and the development of a culture and ethos of managerialism. It found from its enquiries that "the overwhelming commercial imperative for universities to protect their reputation and capacity to earn income was said to have led to a deterioration in the intellectual climate, academic freedom and morale and the increased victimization of dissenters" (Myton, 2001). Research and teaching discourse is increasingly couched in the language of commerce and is driven by financial imperatives. This enterprise culture is expressed in the language of marketing and finance (Acroyd & Ackroyd, 1999; Pratt & Poole, 1999, 2000). Freedom of academic speech has been constrained and critique impaired as academics are subject to subtle or overt pressures to restrain their publicly expressed opinions for fear of breaching commercial confidentiality, or contradicting positions and views of senior university management (MacIntyre, 2001). A commitment to quality as a core organizational value is pursued as an overt marketing strategy, but simultaneously degraded in the process of cost reduction (Warwick, 1999; Sharma, 2001).

Access to university education for much greater numbers of students is held out as emancipatory while at same time has arguably led to an educational delivery and quality that is oriented towards the lowest common denominator. The student has been redefined as a customer (Warwick, 1999; Sharma, 2001) and the research beneficiaries have increasingly been labelled as clients (MacIntyre, 2001). Research has been commodified into published outputs that must be counted, cited and published in defined groups of "highly ranked" journals (Gray *et al.*, 1998; Neumann & Guthrie, 2001). Hence to large degree, publication quantity and publishing medium status have supplanted significance as the values that drive academics' research.

The multiple pressures for measurable performance outcomes experience by academics has arguably produced a more isolationist self-centred approach to academic work by academics as individuals—focussing their efforts upon those tasks that are measured and rewarded, while diminishing or declining involvement in broader scholarly tasks such as journal refereeing, textbook writing, conference/seminar organizing and other collegial activities (Gray *et al.*, 1998; Churchman, 2001).

Thus there has been a significant shift in the interpretive schema of many universities. This has taken place by way of virtual resolution rather than via any evolutionary discourse (Stevens, 2000). External disturbances, working through resultant changes in both university design archetypes and subsystems, have produced significant changes in the interpretive schemes that constitute the university lifeworld. Core values universities now include financial viability, vocational relevance, industry relationships, market share, public profile, and customer/client responsiveness. These values are transparently reflective of

business enterprise values as private sector business concepts and practices have been increasingly imported into the university sector (Guthrie & Parker, 1993, 1998). Such a pronounced values shift has promoted none-too-successful attempts at resistance by academics and subsequent frustration and disillusionment (Warwick, 1999; Stevens, 2000; Gale, 2001b). Academics have, in Habermasian terms, attempted both rebuttal of change (in order to avoid any effect on their core activities) and reorientation (taking on board some processual changes while attempting to avoid any change in core values) (Dillard, 2001). Neither strategies have met with perceptible success. Instead, as former Vice-chancellor of the University of Western Australia, and former president of both the Australian Vice-chancellors' council and the Academy of Social Sciences, Professor Fay Gale (2001, p. 13) has observed:

> Competition seems now to be the central goal of universities—competition for funding, for status, for students both local and overseas, for research grants and for highly productive staff.

Scholarship, knowledge development and transmission, and critical inquiry have been transformed from fundamental core values of the university lifeworld into exploitable intellectual capital for the pursuit of the "new" enterprise university core values. Thus changes in university design archetypes appear to have had a significant colonizing effect on the university lifeworld.

Regaining Paradise

Can academic "paradise" be regained? The answer is probably not. As already observed early in this paper, we require a deeper reflection on our university heritage over the past 500 years (Tilling, 2001) before we can even determine the degree to which the vanishing lifeworld mourned by contemporary academics, actually existed. Nevertheless new forms of the university lifeworld are open to construction. For as long as academics simply attempt rebuttal and reorientation, they may be condemned to the role of the boxer on the ropes—gloves and elbows up while fending off the head shots, lessening the pain somewhat, but scoring no points! A re-engagement of academics in the discourse regarding the pace and direction of university change is required. The Habermasian perspective sees such discourse as an important path to evolutionary change. If we do not attempt to re-engage in this way, then others will continue to redraw the shape and size of the ring while we are busy protecting our heads. If change is to be both productive and inclusive, then it requires a return to a free and vigorous discourse between all key stakeholders, including academics, university management, students and government. Discourse-induced evolutionary change need not be protracted, conservative, unimaginative or purely incremental. It offers the best prospect for evolutionary changes in dominant interpretive schemes that are supported rather than driven by design archetype and subsystem changes.

When engaging in discourse, it is important to evaluate the opportunities that may present themselves to us or that we may offer for consideration by others. For example, collaboration with outside organizations through research projects or in-house teaching programme delivery may offer access to otherwise

unavailable teaching or research case material and research site access for postgraduate and academic researchers. Outsourcing of some formerly internally resourced services may in fact offer some better service range and quality levels. Alternative non-government revenue sources may produce access to research infrastructure funding, teaching facilities development and scientific equipment that might otherwise be prohibitively expensive for universities to acquire. New untapped constituencies in terms of university supporters, research subjects and student groups may also present themselves through changes in the dimensions and scope of university activities. Responsiveness to community concerns may enhance communication of and mutual appreciation of universities' potential contributions to humanity's stock of knowledge. The challenge is to strike a balance between managing threats to valued elements of the university lifeworld while availing ourselves of opportunities that may both change and enhance crucial elements of our interpretive schemes. In attempting this. We must be sensitive to the possibility of opportunities seducing us into dysfunctional changes in core values—i.e. to what degree does a manifest opportunity conceal a latent threat?

Our approach to any engagement in discourse then, must be strategic. It must recognize that there will be arenas of discourse to which access may be unjustly defined us. It must target those areas of discourse that we consider most vital to the productive development of our discursive schemes and to which our access can feasibly, even if with struggle, be secured. We must recognize the likelihood of th persistence of design archetype changes that colonize elements of the university lifeworld. Nonetheless we can recapture some degree of strategic initiative and control through engagement in discourse at all levels—university, community and government. Change is possible through both evolution and revolution. As a precursor to such engagement however, as an academic community we need to reflect upon some fundamental strategic questions (Hussey, 1998; David, 2001):

- Who have we been? What has been out historical identity as academics and what has been the university's historical identity? In what ways has it changed and metamorphosed over time? To what extent have we been attempting to preserve mythical roles and values?
- Who do we want to be? What of our actual past do we wish to preserve? What new roles and interpretive schemes should we assume? To what state can we feasibly aspire?
- How shall we get there? What are our desirable and feasible objectives, strategies and approaches to implementation?

These apparently simple questions have not recently been often asked of themselves by academics, and indeed the task of attempting to answer them is an admittedly complex one. Nevertheless the struggle for answers may yield clues and insights into which of our interpretive schemes is worth defending and what may be open to change.

It will not be enough to reflect upon and determine the nature and scope of change which we consider acceptable. Discourse alone will not be sufficient. Our influence over our university lifeworld requires engagement that proceeds

from debate to implementation. This might best be described as our participating in the management of change through an action-oriented approach. Brewer (1995) argues that utilising this approach, organization members can intervene in the cycle of organizational change, liberating the socially constructed views of organizational culture, systems and activities. In doing so they can foster more diverse perspectives, and a questioning and overturning of existing rationales and logics regarding organizational identity and strategies. Such change discourse and involvement is required on two fronts, cultural and structural—the former being the invisible and the latter being the visible forces that often determine the nature, direction and extent of any organizational change. In many situations they are inextricably intertwined, effective change in one requiring or relying upon change in the other (Stace & Dunphy, 1994). This again suggests that any evolutionary reconstitution of the university lifeworld by academics' re-engagement in discourse with other university stakeholders, required attention to both cultural values that may comprise the lifeworld and the design archetypes and system that are needed to support it.

Dawson (1994) contextualised processual approach to managing change represents a change engagement and management philosophy that offers a path towards translating Habermasian discourse based evolution into action. Effective engagement in university change requires attention to both the process and the outcomes of change. For this, Dawson argues, three major constituents of change must be addressed:

- Substance—the type and scale of proposed/possible change
- Context—the internal, external and historical environment conditioning current practices
- Politics—the political activities of consultation, negotiation, conflict and resistance occuring within and beyond the organization.

In addressing these constituents of change, we must recognize that university change will be a continuously unfolding, non-linear, dynamic process full of unforeseen contingencies, modified pathways and revised strategies. Significant, long-term changes to organization interpretive schemes practices are almost inevitably complex, messy and at times painful, unsettling and stressful to organization members. Empathy, sensitivity and stamina are required of all parties (Dawson, 1994).

In Conclusion

The fundamental conclusions of this paper are that external forces have induced quite substantial changes in university design archetypes and finance, education and research subsystems. The impacts have flowed through to the discursive schemes that constitute the university lifeworld, colonizing it with commercial values. The reversals of relationships have in some cases been dramatic. The

administrative class that formerly supported academic decision-makers, has been transformed into a professional management class that has appropriated strategic decision-making authority and relegated academics to secondary functional service roles. Knowledge based values formerly comprising the lifeworld have been supplanted by commercial values that now exploit subservient knowledge values for their commercial contribution. In the midst of such profound morphogenetic change, academics have been compliant, impotently complaining, intimidated or gagged. Education has become increasingly homogenized, research has become increasingly commodified, academics and administrators have suffered frustration, recruitment of new teachers and researchers has been stagnating, and despite pretences of longer term strategic planning, university, faculty, department and individual horizons and decisions have become short term and resource driven. No-one is a winner—neither students, academics universities, governments nor society.

The analysis presented in this paper suggests that despite the difficulties, barriers and opposition forces, academics must re-engage in the discourse and debate concerning the mission, shape and scope of universities. This requires both constructive critique and proposals for reconstituting the university lifeworld. Our discourse contributions will be better informed by a researched rather than imagined or mythologised understanding of our past heritage, a preparedness to embrace a changing world, and the creativity to reshape and recombine imperative traditional values along with new values that will preserve an inquiring and critical role for universities in society. Determination, persistence and courage will be required.

Acknowledgements

This paper formed the basis for a plenary address at *Symposium 2001: the University and the Corporate World*, convened July 18, 2001 at the University of South Australia, Adelaide, by The University of South Australia School of Accounting and Information Systems and *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. It has also been presented in research seminars at University College Dublin, and the universities of Manchester, Glasgow and Southampton.

References

Acroyd, P. & Ackroyd, S., “Problems of University Governance in Britain: Is More Accountability the Solution?”, *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 1999, pp. 171–185.

Allen, D. & Newcomb, E., “University Management and Administration: A Profession for the 21st Century”, *Perspectives*, Vol. 3 No. 2, Summer, 1999, pp. 38–42.

Anonymous, “Australia’s Corporate University Model Hits US Market”, *Corporate University Review*, Vol. 7, No. 4, July–August, 1999, pp. 18–19.

Anonymous, “New 21st Century Corporate University Emerging”, *Corporate University Review*, Vol. 7, No. 5, September–October 2000a, p. 18.

Anonymous, “Executive Summary: Corporate-College Partnerships: A Best Practice Survey”, *PR Newswire,* CX080P2128, March 20, 2000b.

Arkin, A., “Combined Honours”, *People Management*, Vol. 6, No. 20, October 12, 2000, pp. 42–45.
Baty, P., “Stretched System Set to Snap?”, *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, No. 1503, September 7, 2001, pp. 6–7.
Bell, S., “University–Industry Interaction in the Ontario Centres of Excellence”, *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 67, No. 3, May-June 1996, pp. 322–348.
Boden, R., “Governance and Managerialism”, *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World*, Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, 18 July 2001, `http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm`.
Bolton, G., “Challenges and Changes”, *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 35, September 19–25, 2001, pp. 6–7.
Brewer, A. M., *Change Management: Strategies For Australian Organisations* (Allen & Unwin: St Leonards, NSW, 1995).
Broadbent, J. & Laughlin, R., “Developing Empirical Research: An Example Informed by a Habermasian Approach”, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 5, 1997, pp. 622–648.
Broadbent, J. & Laughlin, R., “Resisting the New Public Management: Absorption and Absorbing Groups in Schools and GP Practices in the UK”’, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1998, pp. 403–435.
Burns, J. & Yazfidar, H., “Tricks or Treats?”, *Financial Management*, March 2001, pp. 33–35.
Caruana, A., Ramaseshan, B. & Ewing, M. T., “Do Universities that Are More Market Oriented Perform Better?”, *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1998, pp. 55–70.
CCST University–Industry Interaction Working Group, “Interactions Between Universities and Industry”, *Going Global: The New Shape of American Innovation,* US Council on Competitiveness, September 1998.
Churchman, D., “Voices of the Academy: Academics’ Responses to a Corporatised University”’, *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, July 18, 2001, `http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm`..
Clarke, S. A., “University of California Customizes Education For Silicon Valley Titans”, *Corporate University Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, March-April 1999, pp. 34–35.
Considine, M. & Marginson, S., *Enterprise University* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
Coy, D. & Pratt, M., “An Insight into Accountability and Politics in Universities: A Case Study”, *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 5, 1998, pp. 540–561.
David, F. R., *Strategic Management: Concepts and Cases* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2001).
Dawson, P., *Organizational Change: A Processual Approach* (London: Paul Chapman, 1994).
Deresky, H., *International Management: Managing Across Borders and Cultures*, 2nd ed. (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1997).
Dillard, J. F., “Dialectical Possibilities of Thwarted Responsibilities”, *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, July 18, 2001, `http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm`.
Dillich, S., “Corporate Universities”, *Computing Canada*, Vol. 26, No. 16, August 4, 2000, p. 25.
Duke, C., “Enterprise and Autumn in Paris”, *Campus Review*, November 8–14, 2000, p. 10.
Fayol, H., *General and Industrial Management*, (translated by C. Storrs) (London: Pitman, 1949).
Gale, F., “Key Issues Close to the Heart”, *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 38, October 3–9, 2001a, pp. 8–9.
Gale, F., “Is There a Crisis in Our Universities?”, *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 35, September 2001b, p. 13.
Gerbman, R. V., “Corporate Universities 101”, *HR Magazine*, Vol. 45, No. 2, February 2000, pp. 101–104.
Gould, G. & Parker, L. D., “Changing Public Sector Accountability: Critiquing New Directions”, *Accounting Forum*, Vol. 23, No. 2, June 1999, pp. 109–135.
Gray, R., Guthrie, J. & Parker, L. D., “Accounting and Management Research: Passwords From the Gatekeepers”, *Accounting Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1998, pp. 371–402.
Guthrie, J. & Parker, L. D., “The Australian Public Sector in the 1990s: New Accountability Regimes in Motion”, *Journal of International Accounting, Auditing and Taxation, (USA)*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1993, pp. 57–79.
Guthrie, J. & Parker, L. D., “Managerialism and Marketisation”, in O. Olson, J. Guthrie & C. Humphries (eds), *Financial Management Change in Australia*, Global Warning: Debating International Developments in New Public financial management, pp. 49–75 (Oslo: Cappelen Akademisk Forlag as, 1998).

Herzlinger, R. E., "Effective Oversight: A Guide For Nonprofit Directors", *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1994, pp. 52–60.
Hussey, D., *Strategic Management: From Theory to Implementation* (Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann, 1998).
Inayatullah, S., "Universities For the Future", *Future Times*, Vol. 4, 1999.
Kay, J., "A Lost Cause", *Prospect*, December 2000, p. 8.
Laughlin, R. C., "Environmental Disturbances and Organizational Transitions and Transformations: Some Alternative Models", *Organization Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 2, 1991, pp. 209–232.
Leatherwood, M. L. & O'Neal, D., "The Transformation of Boards in Corporate and Not-For-Profit Sectors: Diminishing Differences and Converging Contexts", *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1996, pp. 180–192.
MacIntyre, S., "No Longer a Place Apart", *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 36, September 19–25, 2001, pp. 4–5.
Manning, K., "Internationalising Universities: A Strategic Framework", *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, July 18, 2001, http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm.
Marginson, S., "Living With the Other: Higher Education in the Global Era", *Australian Universities' Review*, No. 2, 1999; No. 1, 2000, pp. 5–8.
Marginson, S., "Flying Low: Time to Inject Some Capital", *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 36, September 19–25, 2001, p. 35, 37.
Mavin, S. & Bryans, P., "Management Development in the Public Sector—What Roles Can Universities Play", *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2000, pp. 142–152.
Meister, J. C., "Ten Steps to Creating a Corporate University", *Training & Development*, Vol. 52, No. 11, November 1998, pp. 38–44.
Moore, T. E., "The Corporate University: Transforming Management Education", *Accounting Horizons*, Vol. 11, No. 1, March 1997, pp. 77–86.
Myton, D., "Inquiry Calls For 10-Year Funding Plan", *Campus Review*, Vol. 11, No. 38, October 3–9, 2001, pp. 1–19.
Neumann, R. & Guthrie, J., "The Corporatisation of Research in Australian Higher Education", *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide,, July, 18 2001, http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm.
Parker, L. D., "Historiography For the New Millennium: Adventures in Accounting and Management", *Accounting History*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1999, pp. 11–42.
Parker, L. D., "Back to the Future: The Broadening Accounting Trajectory", *British Accounting Review*, 2001, forthcoming.
Peak, M. H., "Go Corporate U!", *Management Review*, Vol. 86, No. 2, February 1997, pp. 33–38.
Ping, C. J., "Bigger Stake For Business in Higher Education", *Harvard Business Review*, September–October 1981, pp. 122–129.
Pratt, G. & Poole, D., "Global Corporations "R" Us? The Impacts of Globalisation on Australian Universities", *Australian Universities', Review*, No. 2, 1999; No. 1, 2000, 1999, pp. 16–23.
Prince, C. & Stewart, J., "The Dynamics of the Corporate Education Market and the Role of Business School", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 2000, pp. 207–219.
Senate Committee, *Universities in Crisis*, Canberra, Parliament of Australia, Senate Select Committee Report 2001, www.aph.gov.au/senate/committee/EET_CTTE/public%20uni/report/contents.htm
Sharma, U., "University Futures—Implication of State's Public Sector Reform Policies", *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, July 18, 2001, http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm.
Stace, D. & Dunphy, D., *Beyond the Boundaries: Leading and Re-creating the Successful Enterprise* (Sydney: McGraw-Hill, 1994).
Steane, P., "Oils ain't Oils: Strategy Across Sectors", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 10, No. 6, 1997, pp. 461–470.
Stevens, G. E., "The Art of Running a Business School in the New Millennium: A Dean's Perspective", *S. A. M. Advanced Management Journal*, Vol. 65, No. 3, Summer 2000, pp. 21–26.
Stone, M. M., "The Propensity of Governing Boards to Plan", *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, Vol. 1, No. 3, Spring 1991, pp. 203–215.

Sunno, B. P., “Corporate Universities—More and Better”, *Workforce*, Vol. 77, No. 5, May 1998, pp. 16–17.
Tilling, M., “The University in Times of Revolution: Lessons From the Industrial Revolution”, *Symposium 2001: The University in the New Corporate World,* Critical Perspectives on Accounting Journal and School of Accounting and Information Systems conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide, July 18, 2001, `http://business.unisa.edu.au/symposium/papers.htm`.
Valls, J. X.i, “The Challenges of Higher Education in the 21st Century, Globalisation and Universities, New Training and Research Objectives-Mission”, *CMES: World Conference on Higher Education, Paris, UNESCO*, Vol. 6, No. 3, October 1998, `http://lambda.upc.es/catedraunesco/revista/accesretringit/retosde.htm`.
Van Hamel, J. A., van Wijk, H. E., de Rooij, A. J. H. & Bruel, M., “Boardroom Dynamics—Lessons in Governance”, *Corporate Governance*, Vol. 6, No. 3, July 1998, pp. 193–201.
Wallace, J. R. & Ipson, G. Y., “Workforce Development: Business-University Partnerships”, *Economic Development Review*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Winter 1992, pp. 83–84.
Warwick, D., “The Future Business of Universities”, *Universities—UK: Additional Services*, keynote speech, April 23, 1999, `www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/Services/show.asp?p=1\&p=2`.
Wilmoth, D., “The Case of the Disappearing Universities?”, *hotType*, Vol. 2, October 1998, RMIT University.
Yasin, M. M., Czuchry, A. J., Martin, J. & Feagins, R., “An Open System Approach to Higher Learning: The Role of Joint Ventures With Business”, *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, May, 2000, pp. 227–233.