

**UNIVERSITY REFORMS IN A CHANGE CONTEXT  
MANAGERIALIZATION, INTERNATIONALIZATION, NEW PROFESSIONS**

Panel Chair

**Carmelo Mazza**

University of Roma "La Sapienza"  
Grenoble Ecole de Management  
E-mail: [carmelo.mazza@uniroma1.it](mailto:carmelo.mazza@uniroma1.it)

Paper presenters

**Jim Barry**

Organisation Studies Research Group/ELBS  
University of East London  
UK  
E-mail: [j.j.barry@uel.ac.uk](mailto:j.j.barry@uel.ac.uk)

**Elisabeth Berg**

Department of Human Work Sciences  
Luleå University of Technology  
Sweden  
E-mail: [Elisabeth.Berg@ltu.se](mailto:Elisabeth.Berg@ltu.se)

**John Chandler**

Organisation Studies Research Group/ELBS  
University of East London  
UK  
E-mail: [j.p.chandler@uel.ac.uk](mailto:j.p.chandler@uel.ac.uk)

**Yasar Kondakci**

Department of Management and Organization  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
Belgium  
E-mail: [yasar.kondakci@ugent.be](mailto:yasar.kondakci@ugent.be)

**Herman Van den Broeck**

Vlerick Leuven-Gent Management School  
Belgium  
E-mail: [herman.vandenbroeck@vlerick.be](mailto:herman.vandenbroeck@vlerick.be)

**Geert Devos**

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School  
Belgium

E-mail: [Geert.Devos@vlerick.be](mailto:Geert.Devos@vlerick.be)

**Barbara Torell**

European School of Economics, Milano  
Italy

E-mail: [batorell@tin.it](mailto:batorell@tin.it)

**Sandra Romenska**

Department of Educational Studies  
University of Oxford  
UK

E-mail: [sandra.romenska@seh.ox.ac.uk](mailto:sandra.romenska@seh.ox.ac.uk)

### **Abstract**

This panel brings together four contributions that outline the context of institutional and economic change the university transformation is in. By considering broad change trends like those concerning managerialization of the public sector and economic globalization, the specific presentations put specific initiatives of university reform in context and describe the ongoing interplay among wide social dynamics and local change efforts.

### **Session format**

Brief presentations followed by discussion.

### **Relevance for IFSAM**

The issue of the university reform concerns with the spread of knowledge in the globalized world and the emergence of common management practices in the educational domain. The process of university reform shows the acceleration of global management dynamics in the public sector. For that reason, it is of great interest to position the reform of university within the larger discussion on the globalization of knowledge and discuss the interplay among broader dynamics of global management and local reforms. Moreover, in this context, the transformation of university is one of the largest institutional change that are expected to occur and it affects not only the content of the educational offer but also the management of each institution.

**UNIVERSITY REFORMS IN A CHANGE CONTEXT  
MANAGERIALIZATION, INTERNATIONALIZATION, NEW PROFESSIONS**

**Carmelo Mazza**

University of Roma “La Sapienza”

Grenoble Ecole de Management

E-mail: [carmelo.mazza@uniroma1.it](mailto:carmelo.mazza@uniroma1.it)

Universities have been under pressures for broad reforms since the early nineties. On one side, the role of educational institutions is perceived as key in the development of the knowledge society. On the other side, educational institutions are increasingly asked to meet requirements of productivity and efficiency in line with the similar effort in the public sector. In general terms, educational institutions seem to be under pressure to align with globalized trends and ideas diffused from the management context.

Among these globalized trends and ideas, a few of them have been of particular significance to understand the transformation process of universities: internationalization, managerialization and the new competence demands emerging in the labor market. It is of great interest for a research agenda on institutional transformation of universities to shed light on how the reform process at the university level has been coping with the challenges and opportunities originated by these global trends and ideas.

The proposed panel aims to address these issues by presenting contributions analyzing the reform of universities in the context of the broader changes required by the external environment. The panel brings together presentations that deal with these themes in a way that also includes variety in the levels of analysis, the specific settings and the particular issues that are addressed.

The presentations range from inquiries on the context of diffusion of new public management practices as the framework of university reform (Barry, Berg and Chandler) and the meaning and implementation of internationalization programs as a part of a larger change agenda at the institutional level (Kondakci, Van den Broeck and Devos) to the analysis of how universities try to respond to the increasing request of skilled workforce in the EU (Torell), the perception of stakeholders about the changes in the university sector in the highly turbulent environment of Eastern European countries (Romenska).

These collection of presentations will provide a useful medium for the discussion of the role of university in the diffusion of global ideas and of managerial practices in the public sector.

## **Governance, Movement and Managerial Change in Universities` in Sweden and England**

### **Jim Barry**

Organisation Studies Research Group/ELBS  
University of East London  
UK  
E-mail: [j.j.barry@uel.ac.uk](mailto:j.j.barry@uel.ac.uk)

### **Elisabeth Berg**

Department of Human Work Sciences  
Luleå University of Technology  
Sweden  
E-mail: [Elisabeth.Berg@ltu.se](mailto:Elisabeth.Berg@ltu.se)

### **John Chandler**

Organisation Studies Research Group/ELBS  
University of East London  
UK  
E-mail: [j.p.chandler@uel.ac.uk](mailto:j.p.chandler@uel.ac.uk)

There has been much talk in academic circles since the late 1970's of the growth of a new public management (NPM), as public sectors in a number of countries around the world seek to adopt a variety of managerial values and practices, deriving principally from the private sector (cf Hood et al 1999; Pollitt and Bouckaert 2000). The prime mover in this process of change would appear to be economic, although fashion and political considerations are also in evidence as governments seek to satisfy electoral desire for probity and austerity in public affairs through the managerialisation of politics and administration. Growing expectations are also playing their part, as environmentalism and human rights become established agenda items alongside the desire to curb clientalism, in the concern for accountability and 'good governance'.

Issues of governance have also come to prominence in a number of related fields of enquiry and different social science disciplines, attracting scholars from different intellectual backgrounds (cf Pierre 2000; see also Bovaird and Löffler 2003)). These include those concerned with political science and political theory (Bevir and Rhodes 2003), who acknowledge changes in government-society relations that offer challenges to contemporary scholars of democracy; one reason why political sociologists such as Hirst (2001) have shown an interest. Those seeking to explore corporate governance are also involved, invoking expressions of concern about stakeholders which spill over into public sector debates, affecting university management. Yet such interventions, we argue - with the exception of those from political sociologists like Hirst - offer top-down prescriptions for change by either corporate or state elites, abstracted from the daily lives of those affected. In this they share common cause with their NPM counterparts, taking little account of the aspirations, desires and expressed preferences of those whose governance they seek to ensure.

It is accordingly contended that analyses of change from proponents of the NPM and governance suffer from a one-sided view of the change process, which is approached in some texts by way of descriptive or prescriptive overview. In this paper an alternative approach to those identified above is advanced, drawn from the domain of political sociology. This approach draws intellectual inspiration from social movement scholarship, which helps us to sketch the wider parameters of change. This enables us to point to the significant role of democracy in change attempts in the public sector. In this we seek to problematise the separation between state and civil society, seeing them as connected symbiotically, rather than one (civil society) the reactive partner of the other (the state). In short, instead of seeing civil society as separate from or outside the governance of the managerial state (Clarke and Newman 1997; see also Clarke 2004), amenable to its influences and subject to its regulatory practices, we argue that state and civil society are inextricably linked. In order to make our case, we consider some recent interventions concerning the status and conceptualisation of democracy, and the argument that it is amenable to citizen influence through a shared discourse of rationality (Habermas 1995).

For Mouffe (1999), rational abstractions of democracy, of the Habermasian kind in respect of 'deliberative democracy' and ideal speech, are flawed, largely because they are not realisable in practice. The removal of impediments to ideal speech is, for Mouffe, impossible since impediments are enduring and cannot be thought out of existence. Indeed, their materiality is implicated in the creation of democracy itself, and to suggest that they can be eradicated is not only unrealisable, it is also misconceived. The problem for Mouffe is thus an ontological one, her argument being with abstractions. This is not a particularly new idea, of course, antecedents being found in the concerns of Hobbes (1651) and Rousseau (1754). Yet for Benhabib (1987), as Mouffe, such abstractions make little sense in the human world of lived experience. There is a need, thus, to re-conceptualise deliberative democracy. For Mouffe the notion of agonistic pluralism offers a way to take account of the messy character of democracy, of its temporary closure around contingent consensus, continually re-forged. But implicit in her account of agonistic pluralism - perhaps clearer in her earlier work with Laclau (Laclau and Mouffe 1985) - is the importance of social movements in challenging the status quo and top-down perspectives.

Mouffe is not alone in her interest in contemporary notions of democracy. Hirst (2001) is also concerned with the marginalisation of democracy and the concomitant institutionalisation of political conflict, in what he terms the "'post-political" thrust' of governance studies (Hirst 2001: 33). For Hirst (op cit: 28-29), there is a need to democratise 'the organizational society' through 'large scale institutional reform, affecting both the state and social institutions'. This politicisation of civil society is close to what Mouffe (1999: 755) has in mind when she talks of adversaries as legitimate enemies who accept the 'ethico-political principles of democracy'.

We would wish to draw on such insights in order to locate issues of change within a field that recognises the contingent character of social life, both inside and outside universities. The theory and the practice of social movements helps us to understand why and how the top down approach of NPM, and governance, are subject to challenge, particularly from the radical wings of movements such as the environmental and women's movement.

In drawing on social movement theory (cf Jordan 2002), conceptualise through the American inspired resource mobilisation or political process approach (Tilly 1985; Zald and McCarthy 1987; Rucht and Neidhardt 2002), and the European identity-oriented or new social

movement school (Touraine 1985, 2002; Melucci, 1985, 1988, 1989, 1995, 1997), we argue that public sector agendas in Sweden and England have been affected by the influences of their respective women's movements (cf Braig and Wölte 2002) as well as by the new public management and governance systems, on which the literature has been growing (cf Trow 1994; Parker and Jary 1995; Halsey 1995; Sörlin 1996; Dominelli and Hoogvelt 1996; Prichard and Willmott 1997; Von Otter 1999; Askling 1999; Bennich-Björkman 1999; Farnham 1999; Berg 2001; Barry et al 2001; Chandler et al 2002; Bjuremark 2002; Berg et al 2003). The paper explores these developments through the experiences of a group of employees whose voices are heard infrequently in the literature: those in middle-level academic positions in universities responsible for delivering efficiency and productivity gains. In drawing on secondary sources as well as our own empirical research investigation, we seek to examine the processes at work through the experiences of these 'manager-academics' (Deem 2003) at the forefront of change.

The new public management would appear to have had an impact on universities in Sweden and England according to published literature, affecting thereby the ability of women's movement supporters to engage in collective opposition. However, on the basis of evidence we report in the paper, the significance of women's movement activity lies not simply in its visible forms, but in the strength of its submerged networks. Yet the picture is even so a little more complex. This is because whilst the growth and routines of the new public management are subject to powerful symbolic challenges from the women's movement, enacted in everyday practice, it also receives support from those who see in it opportunities as well as threats. This leads us to our main contention explored in the paper: that use of social movement theory allows us better to understand the complexity of change in the drive for efficiencies and productivity gains in the delivery of university education.

## **Bibliography**

Askling, B. 1999. 'Sweden: Professional Diversity in an Egalitarian System'. In: Farnham, D. (ed) 1999. *Managing Academic Staff in Changing University Systems*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Barry, J., Chandler, J. and Clark, H. 2001. 'Between the Ivory Tower and the Academic Assembly Line', *Journal of Management Studies*, 38, 1, 87-101.

Bennich-Björkman, L. 1999. 'Why Universities Need Leaders: The Importance of Departmental Leadership'. In J. Brennan, J. Fedrowitz, M. Huber and T. Shah, (eds) 1999. *What Kind of University? International Perspectives on Knowledge, Participation and Governance*(118-127). Buckingham: Open University Press,.

Berg, E. 2001. 'To be and not to be a lecture in higher education in Sweden', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 11, 12, 57-74.

Berg, E., Barry, J. and Chandler, J. 2003. 'Nice work if you can get it?: The changing character of academic labour in Sweden and England', *Comportamento organizacional E gestao*, 9 2, 231 -249.

Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003) *Searching for Civil Society: Changing patterns of governance in Britain*, *Public Administration*, 81, 1, 41-62.

Bevir, M., Rhodes, R. A. W. and Weller, P. (2003) Traditions of Governance: Interpreting the changing role of the public sector, *Public Administration*, 81, 1, 1-17.

Bovaird, T. and Löffler, E. (eds) (2003) *Public Management and Governance*. London: Routledge.

Bjuremark, A 2002. Att styra i namn av akademisk kollegialitet. [To rule in the name of academic collegiality]. Stockholm: HLS Förlag.

Braig, M. and Wölte, S. (2002) (Eds) *Common Ground or Mutual Exclusion? Women's movements and international relations*. London: Zed Books.

Chandler, J, Barry, J and Clark, H 2002. 'Stressing Academe: The wear and tear of the New Public Management', *Human Relations*, 55, 9, 1051-1069.

Clarke, J. and Newman, J. (1997) *The Managerial State*. London: Sage.

Clarke, J. (2004) Dissolving the Public Realm? The Logics and Limits of Neo-Liberalism, *Journal of Social Policy*, 33, 1, 27-48.

Deem, R. (2003) Gender, Organizational Cultures and the Practices of Manager-Academics in UK Universities. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 10, 2, 239-259.

Dominelli, L. and Hoogvelt, A. (1996) 'Globalisation, the Privatisation of Welfare, and the Changing Role of Professional Academics in Britain', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 7, 191-212.

Farnham, D. 1999. (ed) *Managing Academic Staff in Changing University Systems: International trends and Comparisons*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Habermas, J. (1995) Reconciliation through the Public use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism, *The Journal of Philosophy*, XCII, 3 (March), 109-131.

Halsey, A.H. 1995. *The Decline of Donnish Dominion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hirst, P. (2000) Democracy and Governance. In J. Pierre (ed) (2000) *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy*(13-35). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbes, T. (1651) *Leviathan*, Dent: London (1973).

Hood, C. Scott, C. James, O., Jones, G., & Travers, T. (1999) *Regulation Inside Government: Waste-Watchers, Quality-Police and Sleaze-Busters*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jordan, T., Lent, A., McKay, G. and Mische, A. (2002) Social Movement Studies: opening statement, *Social Movement Studies*, 1, 1, 5-6.

Laclau, E, and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards Radical Democratic Politics*. London; Verso.

Melucci, A. (1985) The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research*, 52, 4, Winter, 789-816.

Melucci, A. (1988) Social Movements and the Democratization of Everyday Life. In J. Keane (1988) (ed) *Civil Society and the State: New European Perspectives* (245-260). London: Verso.

Melucci, A. (1989) Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society. (eds) J. Keane and P. Mier. London: Hutchinson Radius.

Melucci, A. (1995) The Process of Collective Identity. In H. Johnston and B. Klandermans (eds) (1995) *Social Movements and Culture* (41-63). London: UCL Press.

Melucci, A. (1997) Identity and Difference in a Globalized World. In P. Werbner and T. Modood (eds) (1997) *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism* (58-69). London: Zed Books.

Mouffe, C. (1999) Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic pluralism?, *Social Research*, 66, 3 (Fall), 745-757.

Newman, J. (2001) *Modernising Governance*. London: Sage.

Parker, M. and Jary, D. 1995. 'The McUniversity; Organization, Management and Academic Subjectivity', *Organization*, 2, 2, 319-338.

Pierre, J. (2000) Introduction: Understanding Governance. In Pierre, J. (ed) (2000) *Debating Governance: Authority, Steering and Democracy* (1-10). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2000) *Public management reform: A comparative analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prichard, C. and Willmott, H. 1997. 'Just how managed is the McUniversity?', *Organization Studies*, 18, 2, 287-316.

Rousseau, J. J. (1754) *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*. In J. H. Mason, *The Indispensable Rousseau* (53-68). London: Quartet.

Rucht, D. and Neidhardt, F. (2002) Towards a 'Movement Society'? On the possibilities of institutionalizing social movements, *Social Movement Studies*, 1, 1, 7-30.

Sörlin, S. 1996. *Universiteten som drivkrafter*, SNS Förlag, Stockholm

Tilly, C. (1985) Models and Realities of Popular Collective Action. *Social Research*, 52,4, 717-747.

Touraine, A. (1985) An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research*, 52, 4, Winter, 749-787.

Touraine, A. (2002) The Importance of social Movements, *Social Movement Studies*, 1, 1, 89-95.

Trow, M. (1994) 'Managerialism and the academic profession: the case'

Von Otter, C. 1999. 'Inte bara vinster. Nya lednings- och styrsystem i offentlig sektor'. In: Sandberg (red.), Å. 1999. *Ledning För Alla?: Om perspektivbrytningar i företagsledning*, SNS Förlag, Stockholm, 86-106

Zald, M. and McCarthy, J.D. (eds) (1987) *Social Movements in an Organizational Society: Collected Essays*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

# **MORE MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS IN THE ACADEMY: INTERNATIONALIZATION AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS**

by

**Yasar Kondakci**

Department of Management and Organization  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
Belgium

E-mail: [yasar.kondakci@ugent.be](mailto:yasar.kondakci@ugent.be)

**Herman Van den Broeck**

Vlerick Leuven-Gent Management School  
Belgium

E-mail: [herman.vandenbroeck@vlerick.be](mailto:herman.vandenbroeck@vlerick.be)

**Geert Devos**

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School  
Belgium

E-mail: [Geert.Devos@vlerick.be](mailto:Geert.Devos@vlerick.be)

## **Importance**

There have been ongoing change and development efforts in higher education across the world. The prime motive of these change efforts is to effectively respond to the needs of the societies ranging from developing and applying knowledge to developing skilled manpower, which are essential to create knowledge-based competitive economies. Change and development efforts cover different domains such as organizational structure, program structure, or even management of higher education organizations (HEO). One unique change domain is related to the *internationalization* of these organizations.

Internationalization has increasingly becoming a value for HEOs. Historically, by their very nature of producing universally valid knowledge, HEOs are accepted as international organizations (Kerr, 1990). However, the developments in the last 30 years made internationalization one of the top items in the agenda of HEOs. Hence, the need to understand internationalization becomes more and more important.

The purpose of this paper is to conceptualize the internationalization of HEOs from *organizational change* (OC) perspective. Until now the literature has mainly focused on rationales of internationalization and forces of internationalization (Knight, 1999; Callan, 2000; Yelland, 2000, Denman, 2001), and approaches to internationalize (Howe & Martin, 1998; Knight, 1999; McBurnie, 2000; Denman, 2001). Although internationalization is in most cases a comprehensive change process the literature has failed to explicate its process nature (how to change). As a result, many HEOs are trying to internationalize without holding a comprehensive change approach and unaware or ignorant of the rich OC literature which may help them successfully accomplish the internationalization process. Perceiving internationalization as a comprehensive change process this paper aims to be one of the first initiatives to utilize the OC literature for conceptualizing and practicing internationalization in HEOs.

### **Rationales of internationalization**

Although the economic rationale of internationalization has commonly been highlighted in the literature there are other rationales as well. Several authors argued that internationalization has *political* (Knight, 1999), *economic* (Knight & de Wit, 1995; Knight, 1999; Callan, 2000; Yelland, 2000; Denman, 2001), *academic* (Healey, 1998; Hay *et al.*, 2000; Shepherd *et al.*, 2000; Drooglever Fortuijn, 2002; Haigh, 2002), and *cultural/social rationales* (Knight & de Wit, 1995; Callan, 2000; Yelland, 2000).

### **Approaches to internationalization**

Howe & Martin (1998), Knight (1999), McBurnie (2000), and Denman (2001) advanced different approaches to accomplish internationalization in HEOs. These approaches reflect an *open systems understanding*. In other words, these approaches reflect the idea that the organizations exist in a dynamic environment and they need to respond effectively to the developments in their environment for their survival.

Knights' (1999) presented a typology of four in order to elaborate on the approaches to internationalize. Knight (1999) presented *activity approach* (bringing international student body, developing or joining exchange programs) *competency approach* (change in the knowledge, skills, interests, values, and attitudes of different groups of in the organization), *ethos approach* (developing a culture and climate which facilitates internationalization) and *process approach* (developing an international aspects not only into academic aspects of the organization but also managerial aspect) as four basic approaches to internationalize.

These approaches indicate that the universities are pursuing multiple strategies in order to internationalize. Nevertheless, these strategies are not mutually exclusive but interconnected to each other.

### **Internationalization as a change process**

Although there is a growing literature on the internationalization it is a not comprehensive enough to guide the internationalization practices in HEOs. It can be argued that there are two basic reasons for this. First, the major problem with the literature is describing *what* to change and ignoring *how* to change. As a result, the majority of HEOs are trying to build an international dimension by experimenting, trial and error, imitation, and the like. The second problem is related to the magnitude of change that comes with the internationalization process. Internationalization is a major undertaking with implications on structural, human resources, organizational behavior, and financial domains of the organizations (Knight, 1997; Callan, 2000; Yelland, 2000; Haigh, 2002). As a result of the overwhelming load of reorientation the HEOs may stuck at the beginning of the process. Therefore, we argue that perceiving internationalization as a managerial issue and conceptualizing it as an OC process is a necessary first step toward successfully developing international dimension into core functions of a HEO.

It is essential to identify the change process approaches in order to conceptualize the internationalization process as an OC process. Weick and Quinn (1999) divided change process approaches into *episodic* and *continuous change*. Episodic change covers those changes which are intentional, discontinuous, and infrequent. In contrast continuous change covers those changes which are ongoing, evolving, and cumulative (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

This distinction between two main change approaches is instrumental in deciding on the major approach of change to be followed for internationalization process. It is our argument that incorporating an international dimension to the core practices of the HEOs and institutionalizing these changes require an episodic change understanding. In other words, sustained and institutionalized internationalization process is likely to come as a result of intentional and planned change approach. However, this does not mean ignoring the emergent and continuous nature of change. In the internationalization process the organizations are unlikely to identify and formally define every dimension of the change process of internationalization. In other words, the organizations continuously will face with the need to modify the defined dimensions and incorporate new dimensions. Kondakci (2005) in an analysis of an internationalization process in a business school showed that the school formally defined (plan) a limited number of academic and managerial dimensions at the onset of the change program of internationalization (*i.e.*, finance, switch of teaching language, marketing strategy). On the other hand, the school continuously modified these formally defined dimensions (*i.e.*, change strategy, human resources aspects of the process) and developed new dimensions as a result of emergent needs (*i.e.*, modifying the admission process, developing student services, internationalizing the teaching content, *etc.*).

Hence, holding an episodic change perspective and approaching change with a planned approach (transformational or transactional) yet embracing the emergent change originates from the bottom potentially can serve the purpose of internationalizing HEOs. In the literature there are several process models of change (e.g., Lewin, 1951; Judson, 1991; Kotter, 1995; Galpin, 1996; Armenakis *et al.*, 1999; Garvin, 2000; Mento *et al.*, 2002; Whelan-Berry *et al.*, 2003) and content models of change (e.g., Weisbord, 1976; Nadler & Tushman, 1977; Tichy, 1983; Porras, 1987; Burke & Litwin, 1992) which are instrumental for HEOs pursuing internationalization process. Change process models focus on implementation of the change and describes step-by-step how to pursue a change process. On the contrary, content models are conceptual frameworks which have their bases in change theory and reflect both the content of change (what to change) and process of change (how to change). Considering the complexity of HEO the comprehensive Burke-Litwin (1992) is applicable for internationalizing HEOs.

Internationalization has important returns to the countries, individual HEOs, and the groups in these organizations. However, we lack a comprehensive understanding and practicing internationalization process. In this paper we argued that adopting the OC literature to understand and practice the internationalization in HEOs potentially can increase the chance of successfully incorporating international dimension to the HEOs.

## References

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. (1999). Paradigms in organizational change: Change agent and change target perspectives. In R. Golembiewski (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 631-658). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management*, 18(3), 532-545.
- Callan, H. (2000). International vision in practice: A decade of evolution, *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1), 16-23.
- Denman, B. D. (2001). The emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes (TREES) in Europe, North America, and the Asia-Pacific Region. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26(1), 95-106

- Drooglever Fortuijn, J. (2002). Internationalizing learning and teaching: A European Experience, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(3), 263-273.
- Galpin, T. (1996). *The human side of change: A practical guide to organization redesign*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garvin, D. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organization at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalization of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for small world, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(1), 49-66.
- Hay, I., Foote, K., & Healey, M. (2000). From Cheltenham to Honolulu: The purposes and projects of the international network for learning and teaching (INLT) in geography in higher education, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 221-227.
- Healey, M. (1998). Developing and internationalizing higher education networks in geography, *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 22(3), 277-282.
- Howe, W. S. and Martin, G. (1998). Internationalization strategies for management education, *Journal of Management Development*, 17(6), 447-462.
- Judson, A. (1991). *Changing behavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Kerr, C. (1990). The internationalization of learning and the nationalization of the purposes of higher education: Two 'laws of motion' in conflict? *European Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5-22.
- Knight, J. (1997). Internationalization of higher education: A conceptual Framework. In, J. Knight and H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education in Asia-Pacific Countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-28). Paris: OECD/IMHE.
- Knight, J. & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. de Wit (ed.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education--A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Kondakci, Y. (2005). *Practice-based continuous change process: A longitudinal investigation of an organizational change process in a higher education organization*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social sciences*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the university: An Australian case study, *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1) 63-73.
- Mento, A. J., Jones, R. M., & Dirndorfer, W. (2002). A change management process: Grounded in both theory and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(1), 45-59.
- Nadler, A. D., & Tushman, M. L. (1977). A diagnostic model for organization behavior. In J. R. Hackman, E. E. Lawler & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Perspectives in behavior in organizations* (pp. 85-100). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Porras, J. I. (1987). *Stream analysis: A powerful way to diagnose and manage organizational change*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Shepherd, I., Monk, J. J. & Drooglever Fortuijn, J. (2000) Internationalizing geography in higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 24(2), 285-298

- Tichy, N. M. (1983). *Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics*. New York: Wiley.
- Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 361-386.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1976). Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory. *Group and Organization Studies*, 1(4), 430-447.
- Whelan-Berry, K. S., Gordon, J. R., & C. R. (Bob) Hinings. (2003). Strengthening organizational change processes: Recommendations and implications from a multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 39(2), 186-207.
- Yelland, R. (2000). Supranational organizations and transnational education, *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(3), 297-303.

# THE GLOBALIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND THE MOBILITY OF TALENT: UNIVERSITY REFORM THAT MEETS THE CHALLENGE OF THE NEW PROFESSIONS

by

**Barbara Torell**

European School of Economics, Milano

Italy

E-mail: [batorell@tin.it](mailto:batorell@tin.it)

Europe's future remains in the hands of higher learning institutions. According to Friedman (2005:219) as knowledge and technology become increasingly complex... 'the more those with specialized education, or the ability to learn how to learn will be in demand, and for better pay'. Oftentimes, individuals must push themselves 'up the knowledge ladder' because computers or digital technology has upstaged their original learning or talent. In this case, new learning and new skills –again uniquely specialized—must be taken on.

The knowledge society is critically linked to the new, global economy and both contribute to the re-configuration of universities and industry. In Europe, interaction between industry, society and universities is not a new phenomenon; but dates back to the inception of institutions in the 13th century. Zaharia and Gibert (2005) stress that new needs in education and training; expressly scientific and technical knowledge, factors that the university must respond to, including new ways of delivery (e.g. open universities and distance education—a knowledge economy network).

In the Siena workshop, Selwyn Becker (2004) referred to the “business of education” as the development of new knowledge for the curriculum itself. He made the crucial point in his opening statement that “education for business is designed to develop practitioners of business” not to produce research scholars or newly anointed lecturers, skilled in the subject matter. For business schools to retain their relevance, they should recognize that business management is not a science but a profession, and “they must deal with what a professional education requires” (Bennis and o'Toole 2005:2). Nonetheless, the fact that many professors from the humanities have gainfully gravitated to business schools has much to do with increased respect for a business degree. But let us not become confused with the end product; what Becker so aptly identifies as the “practitioner's degree”. Business degrees do have similarities with medical degrees, in that practitioners are and remain the end goal. Indeed, this is precisely what university graduates should take with them--practical knowledge about the workings of business.

In this paper I propose an open dialogue if not an investigation regarding: **1) What** Europe's future skilled workforce (i.e. jobs) might look like and **2) Where** excellently skilled workers will most likely be located (e.g. cities, regions, nations, continents etc.) and **3) How** universities can best prepare graduates to manoeuvre in a future global workforce. Without a doubt, a twenty-first century graduate will more likely be mobile and diasporic in their career choices rather than static and rigid.

Service-dominated industries are no longer defined by only low-paid positions (e.g. hotel workers, waitpersons etc.); on the contrary, the category has been redefined to include a top-paid, specialized service industry identified by Saskia Sassen (2000) as “*advanced producer firms*”. During this past decade, we have witnessed enormous changes in the way business is transacted across borders in what has been described as the global information economy. The new technologies create a flow of labour and capital that in turn deliver a larger share of jobs in the highest-paid occupations. A decline of mass production has been central in driving the expanding set of service groups (i.e. *advanced producer firms*) driven by the instantaneous transmission of data. For example, Japan supports several categories of highly specialized professionals with Western backgrounds such as experts in international finance, Western-style accounting, and Western medicine (Sassen 1996:94). In sum, global financial markets promote interconnectivity, not only in the flow of capital but also in the flow of specialized service workers who sustain flexible, mobile careers in order to deliver the advanced services.

Indeed, the “convergence” of knowledge-work professions foretells that new markets have become increasingly more competitive. Recent technology is already starting to ‘revolutionize’ top paid middle-class careers. The fact that English fluent countries (e.g. Ireland, India, The Philippines) have taken over the bulk of (mostly low pay) routine jobs should not discount a recent trend of outsourcing high skilled jobs to India’s university trained populace. Ed Crooks (1998) provocatively predicted that lawyers, stockbrokers, and other “fat cat” professionals would be the next victims of new technology. Similarly, Paul Krugman (1998) of MIT contends that data manipulation knows no borders and is generally better handled by computers than people. Krugman is correct when he categorizes computer data processing as being the ‘classic internationally mobile business’. As Crooks warns, past victims of automation (e.g. the steelworker of the 80s, the bank clerk of the 90s) could well be a stockbroker, accountant or a lawyer in the next decade.

Technology has advanced so rapidly that former superior-skilled professional careers are hardly exempt from “routinized” or robotic replacement. High-powered computers are eliminating a number of professional positions that were deemed indispensable human endeavours. An American environmentalist Jeremy Rifkin (1995) rather convincingly warns that we are heading for a world in which ‘only a fortunate fifth of the population has properly paid stable employment’. Following Rifkin’s forecast, a cadre of futurists suggested that the ‘*fortunate fifth*’ will be a select ‘hi-tech elite’—the *symbolic analysts* as they are sometimes known—highly educated computer-literate manipulators of data: bankers, engineers, consultants and so on” (Crooks 1998:2). The select group was first identified by Robert Reich (1991) in *The Work of Nations*. He proposed that ‘work in advanced societies falls into three main categories: [1] ‘*routine production services*’, [2] ‘*in-person services*’, and [3] ‘*symbolic-analytical services*’. ‘*Routine production services*’ are repetitive tasks mostly accomplished by blue-collar including white-collar workers as well. ‘*In-person services*’ contrast with the latter mostly in that they are provided directly to the customer or his/her environment. Category three is more likely the one we should be discussing at this conference: *symbolic-analytic services*.

*Who are the symbolic-analysts and what do they do?* Reich (1991:67) argues that the “non-standardized manipulation of symbols—data, words, oral and visual representations have much in common”. In particular, the symbolic-analysts are problem-identifiers, problem-solvers, strategic brokers; all highly skilled people whose ongoing accumulation of ‘varied experience is an asset which makes them relatively autonomous *vis-à-vis* particular places in the organization’. Furthermore, the specialized workforce is set apart from others by their

*independency*. In short, they are linked to global webs of enterprises and far from dependent on “the economic performance of their national contexts”.

Although Reich’s prediction is flawed, the third category is currently functioning in all major global cities (e.g. London, New York, Tokyo, Paris etc.). The career fields exemplifying *symbolic-analysts* require higher education degrees with a minimum level of Masters. They include: research scientists, various kinds of engineers, investment bankers, lawyers, consultancies, corporate recruiters, publishers and writers, musicians, television and film producers and last but not least, university professors. Why you might ask, should we focus on Reich’s proposed view for a global society nurturing a highly specialized workforce of symbolic analysts? Because--at least in the short run--it advances a profile of what the future job market might look like, and by extension a format for higher education to deliver. Moreover, real-world examples currently exist, not only for observation, but for generating curricular research projects--commencing with the global financial centres that house and employ Reich’s university trained practitioners.

The major thrust of this paper portrays the formation of a new transnational class represented by a university-educated corps to manage global capitalism from the center; specifically located in major financial hubs. European university reform will have to take into account socio-economic changes and anticipate the kinds of curricula that will address both the needs of society’s future workforce and the changing landscape that a global economy demands.

## References

- Becker, S.W. (2004) Education for business and the business of education: A proposal for reform. *Workshop on the Process of Reform of the University across Europe*. EIASM: Siena, Italy May 24-25.
- Bennis, W.G. and O’Toole, J. (2005) How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review* 1-5.
- Bowley, G. (2005) Shortfalls in European education cited. *International Herald Tribune* 23 September.
- Chu, J. (2005) How to plug Europe’s brain drain. *Time Europe* 23 September.
- Crooks, e. (1998) The future belongs to the gardeners: Prediction that professional workers could be the next victim of automation rather than manual workers. *The New Statesman*.
- Economist* (2005) A survey of higher education September 10<sup>th</sup> 2005: 1-14.
- Freidman, T.L. (2005) *The World is Flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York:Farra, Straus and Giroux.
- Kanter, J. (2005) European firms bloom by shifting to services. *International Herald Tribune* 7 June.
- Norris, F. (2005) Factory jobs: A drag? *International Herald Tribune*, 15-16 October.
- Reich, R. (1991) *The Work of Nations*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Sassen, S. (2000) *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oakes, CA: Pine Forge Press.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995) On concentration and centrality in the global city. Editors Knox, P.L. and Taylor, P.J. *World cities in a world-system* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 63-75.
- Van Wijk, G. (2004) Evolution of the French Grande Ecole Model and the university reform process: The case of a Business School *Workshop on the Process of Reform of the University across Europe*. EIASM: Siena, Italy May 24-26.
- Zaharia, S. and Gibert, E. (2005) The entrepreneurial university in the knowledge society. *Higher Education in Europe*: Vol. 30 (1) 31-40

# **INNOVATIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE POST-SOCIALIST COUNTRIES: A VIEW FROM COMPLEXITY THEORY**

**Sandra Romenska**

Department of Educational Studies  
University of Oxford  
UK

E-mail: [sandra.romenska@seh.ox.ac.uk](mailto:sandra.romenska@seh.ox.ac.uk)

More than 15 years after the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the post-socialist countries in Central and Eastern Europe hold hard-earned knowledge about the intricacies of change and reform in every aspect of society, including higher education. A look into the dynamics of the transition in higher education can offer insights for the management and planning of change in higher education in a turbulent and often hostile context. The proposed paper describes the results of a comparative study of the perceptions of the reform process of key stakeholders in a number of innovative higher education centres in Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, Kyrgyzstan and the Czech Republic. The study analyses organizational innovation with regard to the special case of higher education institutions being dynamic complex systems in a complex environment. Within the framework of complexity theory the study approaches the higher education system as a complex adaptive system and looks at the interactions among other complex adaptive systems embedded into it – the universities, governmental and non-governmental agencies, etc. It searches for policy formations and phenomena in the system that could be considered to be interpreted as evidences of emergence – the ‘boom’ in private higher education (only in Russia the number of private higher education institutions rose from 0 in 1989 to 500 in 2004), the dynamics in cooperation and competition, the development of a ‘market’ in higher education. The results are used for building an interactive, context dependent, increased-returns model of institutional innovation in higher education with some interesting implications for cooperation and networking patterns across institutions in the region of Central and Eastern Europe for that period of time. The study raises a number of interesting epistemological and methodological questions, whose discussion touches upon issues of the non-linearity of social systems and the possibilities for modelling and mapping social realities.