Global Corporations "R" Us?
The impacts of globalisation on Australian universities

Graham Pratt
UTS

David Poole
UWS

Introduction

Globalisation means different things to different people. To some, it conjures up technologically-inspired images of virtual this and virtual that. To others, it's an "out there" kind of concept which is somehow contributing to an increased intensity of life, the growth of new work pressures, and the perception that virtually everything now has an international or global dimension. Frequently there is confusion regarding the distinction between "globalisation" and "internationalisation". Universities around the world have for generations, perhaps centuries, promoted activities aimed at enhancing internationalisation. However, over the past decade, we have seen globalisation's impact upon universities in the rise of all sorts of entrepreneurial activities previously unknown to the sector.

Laurie Taylor's (1994, p.55) satirical letter from a departmental head to a potential international student is perhaps somewhat closer to the truth than many in the university sector would care to admit.

Dear Mr Adobi

Thank you for your long and fairly interesting enquiry about the M.Phil course in the Department of Media and Cultural Studies.

Let me say straightaway that we are extraordinarily enthusiastic about your potential application. Indeed, no sooner had your letter arrived than Dr Quintock, our graduate chairman, rushed into my secretary's office shouting 'Gor blimey, Maureen, talk about a bit of luck. This could be another nine hundred nicker straight into departmental funds...

Many aspects of university organisation undeniably are becoming more business-like, to the extent that entrepreneurial activities in some universities, such as Monash, are run as mini-corporations inside or alongside traditional university structures. Entrepreneurial funds are seen as crucial for institutional survival by some institutions (Osmond, 1997, p.5). University leaders ambitiously seek to position their institution as, for example, 'Australia's first truly global university' (Chipman, in Osmond, 1998, p.1) in the race for entrepreneurial pre-eminence. Yet, in the flourishing of rhetoric and the parallel dash for cash, it appears that something is missing. Analyses of the real impacts of entrepreneurial internationalisation are rare, and academics who question the educational compromises sometimes made in the pursuit of entrepreneurial success appear increasingly to be treated as pariahs subject to many of the negative consequences commonly applied to whistleblowers in times past.

Commencing with an overview of the general effects of globalisation upon universities, the article proceeds with an analysis of how globalising forces have impacted upon Australian higher education policies. The rise of entrepreneurialism as one response to globalisation from the university sector will be discussed, and attention paid to the impacts of such entrepreneurial activities on academic work. In particular, issues arising at the "coalface" from academic involvement in international entrepreneurial activities will be examined for their positive and negative impacts upon educational standards, academic morale, and the structure of academic work. The article concludes by highlighting four areas of fundamental change now occurring in the sector.

Globalisation and universities

Contemporary contributions to debates about the impacts of globalisation on universities view globalisation as combining 'a market ideology with a corresponding material set of practices drawn from the world of business' (Currie, in Currie and Newson, 1998, p.1). In other words,

rather than viewing globalisation as the product of contemporary trends toward instantaneous communication, faster transportation methods, or the overlapping and integration of cultural elements, globalisation in this context emphasises the significance of neo-liberal ideologies exhorting and cajoling governments and their broader societies toward more market-like behaviours. This article takes this latter perspective.

In the university context, the gap between globalisation and national education policy is bridged by supra-national institutions such as the OECD, viewed as an 'institutionalising mechanism of global ideologies, including market liberalism and new managerialism' by Lingard and Rizvi (in Currie and Newson, 1998, p.267). In particular, the OECD's emphasis on human capital theory and the consequent economic benefits arising from targeted higher education policy have substantially influenced and informed education policies in much of the world.

While it is important to avoid generalisations about the degree of impact of external factors upon domestic policies (Bell, 1997), the Australian higher education sector is arguably one sector in which the impact of globalising economic pressures has been significant for domestic policy development.

For example, the Australian Government's 1987 green paper, 'Higher Education – A Policy Discussion Paper', opened the debate on the need for fundamental reform of Australian higher education and pointed to the future direction of such reforms. Citing Australia's declining terms of trade, the Minister (Dawkins, 1987) argued the need for continuing change and adjustment within the Australian economy, processes which would depend on the development of a well-educated workforce. The review of higher education thus arose, Dawkins argued, from international trends in which the international environment was seen to assume a 'heightened importance' for the nation. Given that the speed of economic change would not foreseeably lessen before the end of the century, the higher education sector would have 'a critical role in the restructuring of the Australian economy'. This philosophy lay behind the subsequent White Paper on Higher Education (Dawkins, 1988) which abolished the existing binary system and replaced it with the Unified National System of comprehensive Australian universities designed to accommodate the growth of a sector aimed to become internationally-oriented and national needs-focused.

Some ten years later, the emphasis placed on international forces as a primary driver of higher education policy had not lessened. By then, however, the pressures of globalisation were being recognised. A discussion paper was commissioned by the Coalition Government in 1997 (West, 1997) to describe the environment in which the next significant round of policy change would occur. This argued that new policies for Australian higher education

should reflect the need for Australian universities to remain globally competitive, and predicted that geographic constraints to the provision of education would continue to lessen. Further, the paper claimed that a global trade in educational services had developed.

The chair of the committee, Roderick West, prefaced his committee's recommendations with the comment that 'today we have the global university' (West, 1998). The committee argued that the trend towards globalisation would continue,

Over the next 20 years, the whirlwind of change that characterises our lives today will increase. The trend to globalisation will intensify and the world will be highly competitive. The digital revolution will cut even more deeply into our lives. The Review Committee considers that education and training will enable people to respond to these challenges and opportunities.

The policy recommendations contained in the report were derived substantially from this perspective. It noted that Australian universities were now facing growing international competition, and predicted that such competition would intensify in the years ahead. The only response possible against such threats would be for the domestic sector to become internationally competitive in an 'increasingly globalised higher education marketplace' (West, 1998, p.63).

Contemporary analyses of Australian higher education frequently cite globalisation as a major influence on the system. Stent (1993), for example, cites the realisation that there is a global and regional interdependence as well as factors such as reduced public funding, demands for the expansion of the system, and increased exposure to community needs and the open market as being characteristic of contemporary influences upon Australian universities. Although only one of these influences is termed "global", it could be argued that reduced public funding is characteristic of the Australian government's response to global forces, both in the higher education sector and elsewhere. It could also be argued that pressures for the "massification" of the system derived from the philosophical desire of the Australian Governments to make the nation a "clever country". This globally-influential philosophy, developed by writers such as Michael Porter and Robert Reich, emphasises national educational and skill endowments as prerequisites for global competitiveness.

The Australian university system may not be globalised to the same extent as other sectors, and it remains removed from "extreme" models of globalisation (Holton, 1997; Cunningham et al, 1997). Nonetheless, Australian higher education policy continues to identify globalisation as a fundamentally important "driver" of reform in the sector, reflecting international movements towards "liberalising" the university sector in response to perceived globalising forces. For example, in discussing the Australian context of higher education policy reforms, Hambly (in Sharpham

and Harman, 1997, p.153) notes that universities throughout the world are being swept along by the forces of internationalisation, while Gale (in Sharpham and Harman, 1997, p.303) states that there are many countries 'experimenting with similar strategies as in Australia to meet the common financial pressures brought about by the kinds of neo-liberal policy convergence centred on a reduced role for the public sector.' One common response to such forces has been the rise of university entrepreneurialism.

A response to globalisation – university entrepreneurialism

According to Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.5), globalisation accelerated the movement of universities and their faculty toward the market. How did this occur? As noted above, this occurred at the macro-level via the convergence of neo-liberal or conservative political agendas designed to encourage nations such as Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom to return to past levels of national prosperity. This goal was pursued via supply-side economic policies, shifts in public funding from welfare to economic development policy areas, and lower overall levels of government spending aimed at reducing public debt.

For the Australian university sector, these policies translated into programs targeted at applied rather than basic research, declines in funding per student as institutional funding lagged behind the "massification" of higher education, the development of governmental structures and policies enabling centralised "steering from a distance", and the encouragement of entrepreneurial activities to supplement traditional funding sources.

In essence, as Slaughter (in Currie and Newson, 1998, p.47) argues, while globalisation may be a universal force to which nations, states and regions respond in unique ways, the global influence of theories of national competitiveness has led to a convergence of similarity in sectoral responses to the new environment:

I found that all four countries (Australia, US, UK, Canada) instituted policies that encouraged commercial research and development and business/vocational curricula, emphasising the value of higher education to national economic activity and displaying a preference for market and market-like activity on the part of faculty and institutions.

For "market and market-like activity", read "entrepreneurialism". Many universities have over a long period exhibited some degree of entrepreneurialism, such as in the development of courses in response to perceived vocational needs. However it is the extent and depth of entrepreneurialism which makes this era qualitatively and quantitatively different to times past. The reliance of faculty and institutional budgets on entrepreneurial revenues is substantial, and pressure increasingly is being applied for the achievement of revenue targets across a range of university activities.

One faculty with which we are familiar provides a stark example of this new reality. Of a total annual budget of about $7 million, around $3 million derives directly from entrepreneurial activities, both local and international. In addition, although this faculty does subsidise other departments and units within the university, the pressure is mounting for traditionally less-entrepreneurial departments such as those in the humanities to raise entrepreneurial funds. This pressure has intensified in recent years following the granting of salary increases to staff, paid for primarily by the institutions themselves in the absence of additional government funding.

Two elements of university entrepreneurialism, namely entrepreneurial research activities and entrepreneurial international (teaching) activities, have received particular attention in the literature, and together provide an appropriate basis for a discussion of the ways in which universities have been "reworked" by globalisation.

Entrepreneurial research

Several studies have endeavoured to quantify the benefits and costs of entrepreneurial research to Australian universities and the academics who comprise them. One such study (Philpott, 1994), at the Curtin University of Technology, attempted to quantify the non-monetary benefits and costs of university entrepreneurialism. In the year in which the study occurred, Curtin raised 35 percent of its revenue from non-government entrepreneurial sources. The study focused on research but also incorporated teaching departments such as business studies. Based on a 1-10 ranking, academics ranked the seven most significant benefits of entrepreneurialism in the following order: prestige (7.6), relations with external bodies (7.5), future consulting opportunities (7.3), spillovers to research (6.8), spillovers to teaching (6.2), equipment gain (5.5), and services contributed by project personnel (5.5). The ranking for costs was as follows: personal social costs (-5.7), academic resources consumed (-4.6), loss of teaching preparation time (-3.8), loss of time for basic research (-3.5), equipment wearing out (-3.5), time of support personnel (-2.7), and monetary loss (-2.6). In sum, Philpott estimated that the ratio of non-monetary benefits to non-monetary costs was of the order of 3.5:1.

An interesting finding for academic work in the Philpott study related to the additional costs and benefits suggested by respondents. A consideration of the number and weighting given to additional cost items, such as time pressures and stressors, led Philpott (1994, p.125) to conclude that,

Unless management can overcome the impact of these (cost) factors or better enhance the benefits, individual university staff members may lower their entrepreneurial sights as the process becomes too demanding on them.

Philpott also noted that researchers are still some way from really understanding the non-monetary impacts of university commercialisation and entrepreneurialism (1994, p.153). On this basis, any conclusions drawn from simple monetary comparisons or occurring in the absence of comprehensive cost data appear to be fraught with difficulties.

Building on the Philpott study, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) studied four national systems of higher education to develop a macro-perspective on convergent issues across national systems. Several Australian universities were also studied as part of a cost-benefit analysis of entrepreneurial research activities, and in an effort to gauge the real impacts of technology transfer strategies upon academic staff. At the national level, Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.106) noted that Australian government shares of university revenues had declined from 90 percent to 78 percent from 1981-1990, and found their preconception that the United States was at the forefront of university commercialisation shaken by their analysis of the Australian context. For two of the universities studied, Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.120) found that the direct revenue benefits of entrepreneurialism were $28.6 million, and that indirect benefits could be quantified at around $52.3 million, giving a total benefit of $80.9 million. Quantifying indirect costs and subtracting these benefits gave a net benefit of $64.2 million, with only 3 of 59 respondents holding that the costs of academic entrepreneurialism exceeded the benefits.

At a micro-level, Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.225) found higher stress levels among academic staff at more-entrepreneurial universities. In studying entrepreneurial departments engaged in technology transfer, they found that ambivalence and confusion about entrepreneurial activities was far greater among more junior staff (lower-level faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate students) than among those located at professorial levels (1997, p.141). In addition, like Philpott, Slaughter and Leslie (1997, p.226) expressed concerns about the levels of stress they had observed among more-entrepreneurial faculty, and wondered 'whether all of this was manageable in the long run...whether the amount of stress upon successful entrepreneurs was sustainable'.

What seems clear from this is that in the absence of a greater understanding of the costs, both direct and indirect, of entrepreneurial research, the current focus upon visible costs and benefits may lead to inaccurate and partial conclusions about the impacts arising from such strategies. As Fairweather (1998, p.102) notes in his analysis of university-industry collaborations, any fair assessment of the long-term benefits of collaboration is problematic, since the short-term objectives of industrial organisations lack any real fit with the long-term focus and multiple-mission nature of universities. Similarly, any comprehensive analysis of the costs and benefits of university entrepreneurialism must remain partial unless sufficient weighting is given to the many indirect and intangible costs arising as well as the direct costs which are often not factored into institutional judgements about entrepreneurial activities.

International entrepreneurial activities

International education marketing is now big business for Australian universities. Goddard (1997) reports that the number of international students studying in Australian universities increased from 13,674 in 1983 to 53,188 in 1996. Growth in the sector is being maintained in part through the development of offshore campuses and twinning programs, while university income derived directly from overseas students rose from $664 million in 1996 to $827 million in 1997 (Maslen, 1998a, p.2).

The impacts on academic work from university international entrepreneurial activities have been immense. While the financial benefits are undeniable, and non-monetary benefits may also exist, less attention has been paid to the problems arising in this sphere of entrepreneurialism. Of particular interest are the potential or real impacts on standards and educational quality, and on the morale and quality of worklives of academics themselves.

The issue of impacts on quality has been raised in some quarters. Marginson (in Smyth, 1995, p.51), for example, argues that the aggressive expansion in overseas marketing has occurred with little attention being paid to quality or educational objectives. The aggressive pursuit of market share as a major motivation is not hidden by senior institutional managers. A recent study of Australian and Swedish universities illustrates the extent to which some institutions see international education as primarily a revenue-raiser. Of 37 responses to the question 'what are the three main reasons for implementing internationalisation at your university?', eight Australian institutions listed 'increased university resources through recruitment of fee-paying international students' as one of the major reasons for their internationalisation efforts. The next most popular reason (preparing graduates to work in a global society/economy) had four responses. No Swedish universities listed the increased university resources option as a major reason for internationalisation (Carnestedt, 1997, p.39).

There are several problems arising which potentially affect academic work. First, there is the problem of coping with students who are clearly not equipped to undertake university studies. Monash academic Dr Andy Butfoy (1998) has written about his astonishment at being asked to employ lower marking standards, leading him to lament the lowering of standards occurring as a result of the quest of universities to make 'a killing in the Asian market'. Similarly, some student leaders are publicly lamenting the acceptance of students with significant language difficulties into local courses, with students 'allowed to continue

for several years before being told their English was not good enough' (Brown, in Coorey, 1996, p.43; Maslen, 1998b, p.5).

Our view is that such problems are not uncommon. We are aware of some overseas programs supervised by local institutions in which students generally have a distinction or high-distinction average leading up to final examinations, and then seek redress when the Australian-marked examinations lead to substantial failure rates. We are also aware of some international programs which attract students on the basis of the possibility of completing postgraduate qualifications in a year, leading to significant problems when the inevitably high proportion of students who fail one or more subjects find themselves unable to return home at the end of the single academic year.

It is also an issue for concern that Australian universities are responding to ethical concerns in ways historically used in some sectors to isolate or eliminate "whistleblowers". Such practices do not represent constructive responses to the type of allegations which should be treated with the utmost seriousness. If the above examples are any indication of the extent of problems in the sector, such issues demand a very different response.

Other notable illustrations of such problems include the following:

- Curtin University academic Dr John Kelmar suspended by the university after appearing on television explaining how he experienced problems after failing nine students, including five international full fee-payers, for plagiarism (Johnston, 1995, p.8, 27)

- former University of Wollongong ethics lecturer Dr Gail Graham, who claims she was 'forced' to lower standards in her subject. Dr Graham claims that problems began after she failed several full fee-paying international students, and resulted in her contract not being renewed (Johnston, 1995, p.8, 27)

- University of Sydney academic Dr Paul Hopwood expressed concern that a full fee-paying student was admitted to veterinary science in August (the course began in March) with no previous training or background in the field. He was placed on disciplinary charges by the university after expressing this concern, however these were later dropped (Reilly, 1998, p.42)

- a tutor at Metropolitan College in Malaysia, a "twinning" institution offering the first year of RMIT and Curtin University degrees, inter alia, alleges that he was sacked after claiming that students 'were given full marks provided they handed them (assignments) in, despite wholesale copying' and that students who could hardly speak English were given exam passes and permitted to enrol in degrees (Maslen, 1998c, p.3).

As Monash vice-chancellor David Robinson admits, some institutions may indeed accept more students than they can comfortably support, while others 'might make an assumption about the ability of a student to satisfactorily complete a course that goes a little bit too far' (Robinson, in Reilly, 1998, p.42).

The reality of insufficient resources being committed to redressing some of these problems has itself become part of the problem. Issues relating to plagiarism, for example, cannot be adequately pursued without attention to academic and student training and supervision (Warner, in Donaghy, 1996, p.5). The unfortunate alternative is that, in the absence of resources, the pursuit of revenue 'heavily influences academic interpretation of and response to plagiarism'. In a similar vein, additional training has been called for in cross-cultural awareness training, cultural sensitivity training, and even 'simple education methods' (Brown, in Coorey, 1998, p.43).

Some surveys of academics support the notion that all is not well in academe. Research undertaken in the graduate engineering and management faculties of a major United States university revealed consistently high support among faculty for international activities, yet also noted that only two-thirds of faculty disagreed with the statement that 'foreign students are a nuisance because they are always haggling for higher grades' (Lulat, 1993, pp.337-339). Similarly, research about faculty attitudes to overseas teaching assignments undertaken by staff in the School of Management, Technology and the Environment at La Trobe University revealed that less than two-thirds of "travelling faculty" disagreed with the view that overseas teaching detracted from work at home. Significantly, just 40 percent of "non-travellers" disagreed with this view, thus pointing towards concerns about international activities which may be held by those academics not directly associated with such activities (Griffiths *et al*, 1998, p.57)

Perhaps these issues arise because of the "teething problems" common to new industries, and this industry may indeed be a 'global market in the early stages of development' (Marginson, in Smyth, 1995, p.28). Still, that does not excuse inadequate responses to problems from organisations which have historically been characterised by a commitment to due process and collegiality.

An alternative explanation presents a two-dimensional explanation which, we believe, provides a more accurate rationale for these problems. First, our public policy and institutional approaches to entrepreneurialism encourage the view that students are consumers in a traditional marketing sense. The natural consequence of this view is that our "customers" demand not just high-quality products and services (no bad thing!) but also expect a tangible "product" (i.e. a degree testamur) in return for the significant price paid for this service experience. Direct or indirect pressure is thus applied to academics to provide this "product", and there are few places to go if individual academics feel that such pressure is unwarranted or unwanted. In addition, some academics have few other

employment options, making pursuit of such issues less likely. Second, the contemporary ongoing expansion in international education markets has enabled institutions to sometimes neglect issues of quality assurance and the maintenance of standards. From an institutional perspective, it has historically been possible to take the view that having some "dissatisfied customers" was not a major cause for concern, since there would always be more potential customers and markets to pursue. However, in an international market which is evolving toward maturity, and which has in fact reached saturation in markets such as Hong Kong and Singapore (Evans and Kemp, 1997, p.3; van Leest, 1998, p.5), issues such as quality, standards, and "brand image" begin to assume a new importance. It is hoped that this life-cycle process may bring new attention to such important issues. Perhaps the most accurate forecast about the potential for quality to be compromised was made by Roger Scott (1987, p.167) on the eve of the great Australian foray into international education, when he stated that 'one lesson is that financial aspects tend to overwhelm concern for social, cultural and institutional issues posed by the presence of large numbers of overseas students'.

The situation is not helped by research which, in endeavouring to portray international education in a positive light, instead takes a politically-correct stance which dilutes the potential value of the findings to international education. For instance, although recent research on the benefits flowing to local students from the presence of international students at the University of NSW found that there are several perceived benefits arising from such presence, it also labelled as "racist" comments by local students that 'the maximum ratio of international to local students should be 10 percent', and that 'they should be made to stay after qualifying and give something back to Australia'. Further, the researchers noted that 'even many of those in favour of an increased number of international students made comments which were at the best patronising' (Pittaway *et al*, 1998, p.69). Such comments do little to assist the debate.

Arising from this discussion of university entrepreneurialism are several issues which relate to the consequences of such activities for academic worklives and morale.

University entrepreneurialism – impacts on academic worklives and morale

In general terms, morale does not appear to have been particularly high in Australian universities for much of the 1990's. For instance, over 70 percent of academics expressed concern about morale, overall quality and working conditions as a result of changes occurring in the sector over the 1992-1997 period (Maslen, 1997, p.10). Similarly, 47 percent of deans, heads, and faculty executive officers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that "in general, the morale of academic staff is

high" in a recent national study (Meek and Wood, 1997, p.81).

If morale is a function, to some degree, of changes to the structure and rules of work, then it is arguable that entrepreneurial activities can significantly affect morale via the effect they have on academic work. Many academics are now regularly involved in supervising offshore delivery of their units and courses, in marking assignments and providing feedback to students thousands of kilometres away in distant offshore programs, in assisting in international recruitment, in developing new modes of course delivery, in switching between academic terms and semesters of varying lengths, and in continuing to adjust teaching and assessment methods to the burgeoning local foreign student market. Such moves toward more "corporate professionalism" and less "non-market" academic activity place pressure on academics to achieve institutional objectives and to play their part in implementing entrepreneurial strategies, at the cost of increased market surveillance and less individual autonomy (Marginson, in Smyth, 1995, p.34).

Entrepreneurial strategies may indeed be positive for some, but this is by no means the outcome for all. Entrepreneurialism may threaten long-held academic values, and it excludes less potentially-entrepreneurial departments and faculties such as those in the humanities and some social sciences (Kennedy, in Wanna *et al*, 1996, p.145). Still, even here the pressure to be entrepreneurial is felt. One small institution with which we are familiar has just listed its entrepreneurial revenue targets for each department, and has included a $250,000 target for a very small humanities department. How the department will raise such funds is anyone's guess, but presumably much effort will need to be expended in pursuing such an ambitious target. We wonder if such efforts are worthwhile, since the time and costs demanded for individuals and departments to become entrepreneurial may well be greater than the benefits. As Forster *et al* (in Wanna *et al*, 1996, p.14) note, 'public servants are often ill-prepared and little-trained for this potentially momentous step' (*toward entrepreneurialism*), since it is so different to traditional administrative practice.

Thus, on the basis of the new competitive pressures which now face universities, work practices have been and continue to be placed under pressure. Academic workers are being treated more and more like employees with the regulated and codified work practices common to staff in non-academic organisations (McInnes, in Schuller, 1995, p.43). The market is continuing to extend its influence into academic work to an arguably far greater extent and rate than occurred in previous times (Currie and Newson, 1998, p.4). Academic entrepreneurialism is one force encouraging this trend.

The likely result of this trend is that universities will continue to be perceived as becoming more like other

organisations, and more likely to be subject to the same rules, regulations and perceptions as other organisations (James, 1998, p.69). Slaughter and Leslie's (1997, p.222) analysis of the impacts of entrepreneurial research programs arrived at a similar conclusion. The technology transfer strategies investigated served to increasingly integrate academic, commercial and bureaucratic cultures, decreasing the distance between universities and business and industry, and between universities and government.

From a cross-national perspective, Miller (in Smyth, 1995, p.56) concludes that although academics retain substantial powers over the processes of teaching and research, the 'raw materials (students or problems to be investigated) are increasingly determined by the combined influences of the state, institutional managers and the market'.

Concluding observations

It has been argued that the combined forces of globalisation and financial stringency, stemming in part from neoliberal political ideology, have prompted university executives in Australia to embrace entrepreneurialism. This has been reflected in an increased emphasis upon the commercial opportunities from applied research and the thrust to expand markets for international fee-paying students.

Unfortunately, there are few studies that have attempted to identify the indirect and intangible costs of these institutional shifts. Yet, the changes are fundamental and threaten to transform Australian universities. Spirited public debate is overdue.

One fundamental change is in the **change to university missions and cultures** in Australia. It is argued that we are witnessing the gradual absorption of universities into the corporate sector (Newson and Buchbinder, 1988, p.90). This becomes self-legitimising with the adoption of the language and rhetoric of marketing (McInnes, in Schuler, 1995, p.39). Mission statements are being amended to reflect higher priorities on internationalisation, workplace learning and commercially applied research. Often remaining implicit in mission statements, but nonetheless powerful, is the significant emphasis upon revenue raising from various markets, the profit making orientation. Fairweather (1988, p.75) questioned whether the "fabric" of an academic institution is threatened if fundamental questions of university mission are altered in the pursuit of funding.

A second fundamental change is the **uneven impact of entrepreneurialism** upon different parts of universities. Just as globalisation has been found to widen the gap between rich and poor nations (Martin and Schumann, 1997), entrepreneurialism has been of enormous benefit to the more market-oriented faculties, while placing more traditional faculties at a significant disadvantage. The latter faculties are often forced to struggle with less

resources, sub-standard building and equipment, and are expected to carry a disproportionate share of staff redundancies. Downsizing, amalgamation or abolition are ever-present threats for such faculties or departments, while "cash cow" faculties enjoy superior conditions, relatively unscathed by general financial pressures. If allowed to continue, such disparities could lead to the disappearance of some academic disciplines and associated vocations, while universities could lose their ability and legitimacy to provide objective and independent critiques of issues vital to the future of society. At a micro level, some universities could have a narrower and unbalanced range of academic disciplines and departments, raising the question of whether they should any longer be regarded as a "university" as distinct from a vocational training college.

This is not to deny the many benefits which arise from the funds flowing from university entrepreneurialism. Nor is it to deny that corporate practices can potentially make universities more efficient and effective. However, such practices must be transferred with caution, and embraced only with appropriate adaptation. If there is a major flaw in our adaptation of business entrepreneurialism, it is in the time-lag occurring in the transfer of these practices from the corporate sector. Often such practices are being discarded by businesses at the very time that universities embrace them. Improved institutional adaptation to entrepreneurialism could be encouraged by a substantial reduction in such take-up periods.

References

Baker, M., Creedy, J. and Johnson, D., (1996) *Financing and Effects of Internationalisation in Higher Education: An Australian Study*, EAIP, 96/14, Canberra: DEETYA.

Bell, S., (1997), 'Globalisation, Neoliberalism and the Transformation of the Australian State', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, Vol.32, No.3, 345-367.

Butfoy, A., (1998), 'Students lost in market share war', *The Age*, 24 March.

Carnestedt, E., (1997), '*Internationalisation Strategies in Higher Education – A comparative study between Swedish and Australian universities'*, Unpublished masters thesis, Institute of International Education, Stockholm University.

Coorey, M., (1996), 'AusAID students "poorly counselled"', *The Australian*, 12 June, p.43.

Cunningham, S., Tapsall, S., Ryan, Y., Stedman, L., Bagdon, K. and Flew, T. (1997) *New Media and Borderless Education: A Review of the Convergence between Global Media Networks and Higher Education Provision*, Canberra: AGPS.

Currie, J., (1998), 'Introduction', in Currie, J. and Newson, J. (eds.), *Universities and Globalisation – Critical Perspectives*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Dawkins, J., (1987), *Higher Education – A Policy Discussion Paper*, Canberra: AGPS.

Dawkins, J., (1988), *Higher Education – A Policy Statement*, Canberra: AGPS.

Donaghy, B., (1996), 'Plagiarism – or is it a mark of respect?', *Campus Review*, 4-10 December, p.5.

Evans, G. and Kemp, N., (1997), '*The Changing Market for International Education – the UK Experience'*, Paper presented to the IDP Education Australia Conference, 30 September – 2 October, Melbourne.

Fairweather, J.S., (1988), *Entrepreneurship and Higher Education: Lessons for Colleges, Universities, and Industry*, Washington DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6.

Forster, J., Graham, P. and Wanna, J,. (1996), 'The New Public Entrepreneurialism', in Wanna, J., Forster, J. and Graham, P., (eds.) *Entrepreneurial Management in the Public Sector*, Melbourne: Macmillan.

Gale, F., (1997) 'Where does Australian Higher Education need to go from here?', in Sharpman, J. and Harman, G. (eds.), *Australia's Future Universities*, Armidale: University of New England Press.

Goddard, B., (1997), '*Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee International Relations Strategic Plan'*, paper presented to the IDP Education Australia Conference, 30 September – 2 October, Melbourne.

Griffiths, J., Wehwsack, G. and Watson, A., (1998), 'The Effects of Overseas Teaching Experiences on Professional and Curriculum Development in an Australian University', in Davis, D. and Olsen, A. (eds), *Outcomes of International Education: Research Findings*, Canberra: IDP.

Hambly, F., (1997), 'Some perceptions of Australian higher education: Past, present and future', in Sharpman, J. and Harman, G. (eds.), *Australia's Future Universities*, Armidale: University of New England Press.

Holton, R.J., (1997), *Some Myths About Globalization*, Pre-Conference Discussion Paper for the HERDSA '97 Conference, Adelaide.

James, D., (1998), 'Universities are creaking, and may yet lose out to slicker foreign competitors', *Business Review Weekly*, 13 April, pp.68-70.

Johnston, C., (1995), 'The buck stops here', *Campus Review*, 27 July, pp.8, 27.

Kennedy, K., (1996), 'Entrepreneurialism in the University Sector', in Wanna, J., Forster, J. and Graham, P., (eds.), *Entrepreneurial Management in the Public Sector*, Melbourne: Macmillan.

Lingard, R. and Rizvi, F., (1998), 'Globalisation, the OECD, and Australian Higher Education, in Currie, J. and Newson, J. (eds.), *Universities and Globalization – Critical Perspectives*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lulat, Y., (1993), '*The Academic Impact of Foreign Graduate Students: Perceptions of Faculty'*, Unpublished PhD thesis, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Marginson, S., (1995), 'Markets in Higher Education: Australia', in Smyth, J. (ed.) *Academic Work – The Changing Labour Process in Higher Education*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Martin, H-P. and Schumann, H., (1997), *The Global Trap*, New York: Zed Books.

Maslen, G., (1997), 'Why academics are feeling down Down Under', *The Time Higher Education Supplement,* 14 February, p.10.

Maslen, G., (1998a), 'Education exports are world-class', Campus Review, 27 May – 2 June, p.2.

Maslen, G., (1998b), 'Universities under fire over "commercial games"', *Campus Review*, 1 - 7 April, p.5.

Maslen, G., (1998c), 'RMIT denies claims of dishonesty', *Campus Review*, 29 July – 4 August, p.3.

McInnes, C., (1995), 'Less Control and More Vocationalism: The Australian and New Zealand Experience', in SCHULLER, T. (ed)., *The Changing University?,* Buckingham SHRE and Open University Press.

McNay, J., (1995), 'From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities', in SCHULLER, T. (ed)., *The Changing University?,* Buckingham SHRE and Open University Press.

Meek, V.L. and Wood, F.Q., (1997), '*Higher Education Governance and Management – An Australian Study'*, EAIP, 97/1, Canberra: DEETYA

Miller, H., (1995), 'States, Economies and the Changing Labour Process of Academics: Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom', in Smyth, J. (ed.) *Academic Work – The Changing Labour Process in Higher Education*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Newson, J. and Buchbinder, H., (1988), *The University Means Business*, Toronto: Garamond Press.

Osmond, W., (1997), 'CQU windfall tip in new market era', *Campus Review*, 8 - 14 October, p.5.

Osmond, W., (1998), 'Chipman's global alliance takes shape', *Campus Review*, 4 – 10 October, p.1.

Philpott, R.F., (1994), *Commercializing the University: The costs and benefits of the entrepreneurial exchange of knowledge and skills*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Arizona.

Pittaway, E., Ferguson, B. and Breen, C., (1998), 'Worth More Than Gold: The Unexpected Benefits Associated with Internationalisation of Tertiary Education', in Davis, D and Olsen, A. (eds.), *Outcomes of International Education: Research Findings*, Canberra: IDP.

Reilly, G., (1998), 'Fee and easy', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 18 April, p.42.

Scott, R., (1987), 'Biscuits, Bicycles and B.Sc's: The Impact of Market Forces on the Management of Publicly Funded Universities', *Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration,* Vol.9, No.2, 157-171.

Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L., (1997), *Academic Capitalism*, Baltimore: John Hopkins.

Stent, D., (1993), *Think internationally mange locally*, in Proceedings of XVII Annual AITEA and AAPPA Conference, Queensland: AITEA.

Slaughter, S., (1998), 'National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy', in Currie, J. and Newson, J. (eds.), *Universities and Globalization – Critical Perspectives*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Taylor, L., (1994), *The Laurie Taylor Guide to Higher Education*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Van Leest, A., (1998), *Update on the Internationalisation of Australian Education*, Paper presented to the Education '98 Conference, 17 – 19 March, Sydney.

West, R., (1997), *Learning for Life (A Policy Discussion Paper)* – Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy, Canberra: AGPS.

West, R., (1998), *Learning for Life (Final Report)* – Review of Higher Education Financing and Policy, Canberra: AGPS.