



## **Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives**

PATRICIA J. GUMPORT

*Stanford University, USA*

**Abstract.** A perennial challenge for universities and colleges is to keep pace with knowledge change by reconsidering their structural and resource commitments to various knowledge areas. Reflecting upon changes in the academic landscape of public higher education in the United States over the past quarter of a century, the author diagnoses a macro-trend whereby the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education has changed from higher education as a social institution to higher education as an industry. Three interrelated mechanisms are identified as having advanced this process: academic management, academic consumerism, and academic stratification.

This pattern of academic restructuring reflects multiple institutional pressures. While public universities and colleges have increasingly come to rely on market discourse and managerial approaches in order to demonstrate responsiveness to economic exigencies, they may end up losing legitimacy as they move away from their historical character, functions, and accumulated heritage as educational institutions. Thus, responsiveness to compelling economic pressures that dominate contemporary organizational imperatives in an attempt to gain legitimacy in one dimension may result in loss for another. Wholesale adaptation to market pressures and managerial rationales could thereby subsume the discourse about the future of colleges and universities within a logic of economic rationality at a detriment to the longer-term educational legacies and democratic interests that have long characterized American public education.

### **Introduction**

A perennial challenge for higher education institutions is to keep pace with knowledge change. In addition to investing in new faculty positions and launching targeted fund-raising activities, a prominent set of responses at the local campus level is to alter the academic structure by adding, or conversely by deleting, courses, degree programs, and departments. While the prevailing image of knowledge change in higher education has tended to be either inertia or expansion, those who have made their professional lives within higher education settings during the recent past also know otherwise – that is, they understand the threat, if not the reality, of selective consolidation and program elimination, particularly for those academic areas that are deemed of insufficient centrality, quality, or cost-effectiveness (Gumport 1993).

No doubt these are difficult times for those who manage higher education institutions. In addition to a difficult political climate with diminished public confidence, financial realities loom large alongside pressure to consider alternative structural and resource commitments to various knowledge areas. For the most part, administrators and faculty do not have the option of widespread additive solutions that their predecessors enjoyed. Deliberations over academic restructuring and resource reallocation seem endless – often bogged down by process without adequate attention to the substance and likely consequences of proposed changes. Unprecedented public scrutiny of the academic enterprise exacerbates tensions on campus between proponents of different academic areas, between those responsible for planning as opposed to those responsible for safeguarding faculty governance, and between those who advocate compliance with external demands for demonstrated accountability versus those who argue for resistance.

The intermingling of academic considerations with wider economic and political concerns suggests that deliberations over whether or not and how to reorganize academic units are likely to be ongoing. At the same time though, little is known about the consequences of structural and material resource shifts across academic areas, for either the students or the broader society. Moreover, we do not know whether there will remain any shared sense of institutional purpose and a basis for interdependence on campuses, and whether core academic activities of knowledge creation, preservation, and transmission will remain viable either as a complementary set or as separate functions.

Against this backdrop of concerns, the primary objective for this article is to sketch out a thesis about a set of neglected yet critical issues for public higher education organizations as they consider their commitments to various knowledge areas and possibly reshape their landscape of academic offerings.<sup>1</sup> In order to draw some parameters and to make manageable ensuing empirical research, the thesis focuses on a macro trend that depicts changes in the last quarter of the twentieth century in public colleges and universities in the United States.

This thesis has three parts, each putting forward important conceptual distinctions.

- 1) Over the past 25 years, academic knowledge in U.S. public colleges and universities has been reorganized along a utilitarian trajectory such that, at the macro level, the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education has changed from higher education as a social institution to higher education as an industry.
- 2) Three interrelated mechanisms have converged to advance this process:
  - a) the rise of academic management in colleges and universities, drawing

upon discourse from management science and organizational research for its professional ideology and position descriptions; b) the rise of academic consumerism, moving beyond the post-World War II decades of massification and its attendant democratic gains to elevating as paramount economic-consumer interests; and c) the re-stratification of academic subjects and academic personnel, based upon the increased use-value and exchange-value of particular knowledges in the wider society.

- 3) One consequence of these converging forces is that the management of public higher education institutions faces formidable legitimacy challenges, where reconciling competing institutional logics is difficult. The inherent tensions are evident in academic restructuring dynamics on a range of campuses.

Before presenting the thesis, identifying my assumptions at the outset may be helpful. When considering the nature and direction of change in higher education, there seems to be consensus that the locus of academic reform, if not control, extends to a range of factors beyond local campus settings. Not only have economic and political demands proliferated, but satisfying them all is ultimately elusive – due either to the prohibitive cost or to the irreconcilability of conflicting mandates. For higher education in the United States, particularly public colleges and universities, there are formidable expectations to improve access, enhance quality, and cut costs, even as campuses are expected to embrace new information and communications technologies that are in themselves costly and unproven. Moreover, the contemporary accountability climate has in effect squeezed public higher education into a vise, even as various legislative and state actors have taken it upon themselves to dissect the enterprise, inspecting slices of academic life/work/teaching/learning under a microscope. The assessment paradigm has an apparently unlimited reach, imposing an organizational and individual performance metric on every aspect of higher education with profound consequences for the academic workplace (Gumport 1997). This trend is also evident in Europe (Neave and Van Vught 1991; Dill and Sporn 1995).

In an effort to demonstrate responsiveness, the organizational willingness to embrace efficiency and flexibility as priorities is both impressive and, unfortunately very troubling. It is “impressive” because such adaptive responses just may help public higher education survive an era of unprecedented competition and public scrutiny, and “troubling” because of the potential damage to public higher education as an intellectual enterprise, the further erosion of knowledge as an end in itself and the narrowing of academic offerings for different segments of student populations.

Within the study of higher education as well as the management of colleges and universities, I am concerned that the ways in which we talk and think about higher education have increasingly relied upon a production metaphor, borrowing imperatives from corporate settings. I am concerned that technical, market imperatives run wild, urging colleges and universities to adapt to short-term market demands, to re-deploy resources (which include people, e.g., faculty), in an effort to reposition themselves within an increasingly competitive context. I am concerned that a premium has been placed upon adaptation without careful scrutiny of the gradual institutional change underway in the character of public higher education. I am concerned that the educational and societal consequences emerging from changed academic commitments will be far-reaching, as very different academic programs become available to different segments of student populations, further stratifying the inequality of life chances across socioeconomic groups. Furthermore, and somewhat selfishly I suppose, I fear that the things I care most about will be deemed inefficient, inflexible, and thus no longer affordable. I disclose these concerns to make explicit the normative underpinnings of the thesis as well as to foreshadow my criticism of attempts to reduce higher education institutions to organizations *per se*, my concern over adapting public higher education to short-term economic exigencies at a detriment to longer-term educational legacies and democratic interests, and my hope for further deliberation about the legacy of higher education as a social institution within which knowledge has to some extent been considered a public good.

### **1. The legitimating idea of public higher education**

The macro trend is in essence an historical proposition that the dominant legitimating idea of public higher education has been moving away from the idea of higher education as a social institution, and moving toward the idea of higher education as an industry.

A legitimating idea at the macro societal level suggests that there are taken-for-granted understandings that constitute parameters for what is legitimate – that is, what is expected, appropriate, and sacred, as well as the converse. In the realm of higher education, both of the aforementioned legitimating ideas have distinct premises regarding what is valued, what is problematic, and what is in need of improvement in public higher education. Simply stated, from the perspective of higher education as an industry, public colleges and universities are seen increasingly as a sector of the economy; as with firms or businesses, the root metaphor is a corporate model of production – to produce and sell goods and services, train some

of the workforce, advance economic development, and perform research. Harsh economic challenges and competitive market pressures warrant better management, which includes swift programmatic adjustment, maximum flexibility, and improved efficiency in the direction of greater accountability and thus customer satisfaction. In contrast, from the perspective of higher education as a social institution, public colleges and universities by definition must preserve a broader range of social functions that include such essential educational legacies as the cultivation of citizenship, the preservation of cultural heritage(s), and the formation of individual character and habits of mind.

The tension between the two legitimating ideas is profound. The former perspective is dominated by a concern that higher education's inability or unwillingness to adapt will result in a loss of centrality and perhaps ultimately a loss of viability. Evidence is found in widely-cited proclamations that higher education has already lost the ability to judge itself in the United States (Pew 1993a, b, c, 1994; Zemsky and Massy 1990; Gumpert and Pusser 1999) and in Europe (Neave and Van Vught 1991). In contrast, the latter perspective is dominated by a concern that adaptation to market forces gives primacy to short-term economic demands at the neglect of a wider range of societal responsibilities, thereby jeopardizing the long-term public interest including the notion of knowledge as a public good. Further explication of the contrast may be instructive, in order to show that public colleges and universities may change how they try to link up with wider institutional logics.

### *1.1. Higher education as an industry*

The perception of higher education as an industry primarily views public colleges and universities as quasi-corporate entities producing a wide range of goods and services in a competitive marketplace. A research university may be thought of as offering a very diverse product line, especially in the post-World War II era of Kerr's (1995, orig. 1963) "multiversity". Alternatively, an entire state's public system of higher education may be seen as offering an even more diverse range of goods and services: community colleges offer degrees or one course at a time, in many fields, to people of all ages, while the flagship university offers many courses and levels of degrees across hundreds of fields of study, professes to serve national, state, local economic needs, and sells entertainment in sporting and cultural events to the local community.

Ideally, according to microeconomic theory, organizations are managed based upon values of economic rationality. The main services of teaching and research are variously supplied and priced to correspond to laws of supply and demand. Students, parents, state legislatures, employers, and research funders are seen as customers. Particular customers have different tastes and preferences. Other people, such as faculty employed by the organization, are

presumed to participate out of calculative involvement. As such, they can be motivated to be more productive through the use of incentives and sanctions. Major obstacles to maintaining the organization's viability include: fixed costs and inefficiencies; competition and oversupply; uncertainty and imperfect information. Guiding principles for the organization's managers are to know its liabilities and assets, to anticipate costs and benefits, to enhance efficiency and flexibility, and – as realized in the contemporary quality movement – to increase customer satisfaction (e.g., Seymour 1992).

The insights of this perspective focus on the harsh realities of market forces and the urgency of doing something to stay competitive, be it planning strategically, scanning environments, attempting to contain or cut costs, correct inefficiencies, or doing whatever it takes to maximize flexibility. Adjustments include changing product lines, substituting technology for labor, and reducing fixed costs through such means as outsourcing and privatizing as well as increasing the proportion of part-time and temporary personnel. Doing nothing is not an option. Such imperatives have been popularized in the reengineering movement in the 1990s, catapulted by variations on Hammer and Champy (1993).

Within this conceptualization, it is valuable to view higher education as having not just one major marketplace, as determined by type of student served, or geographic location, or degrees granted. Instead, we can see several types of markets at work simultaneously – not only for obtaining students, but for placing graduates, hiring and retaining faculty, obtaining research funding, establishing collaboration with industry, maintaining endowments, sustaining and extending alumni giving and other fundraising sources, and so on.

A contemporary feature of higher education markets is the increased presence of non-traditional providers in several markets, the most prominent being the emergence of virtual higher education aided by new telecommunications technologies and altering the competitive playing field by attracting students (Marchese 1998). The major barometer for managers is to read the market for constraints and opportunities relevant to the viability of their niche; if done well, a higher education organization can capitalize on untapped demand, allowing it to supply the educational product at a higher price. The decision to add an academic program could be seen as a strategy to position the college or university to attract new customers and thereby increase revenue. Similarly, an increase in tuition can be explained as appropriate due to increased demand or decreased supply of a particular educational product (for example, a professional degree in engineering, business, or law). Hence, programmatic changes can be seen as prudent market corrections.

All of this should sound quite familiar to observers of contemporary higher education management. The corporate metaphors of production in a competitive marketplace are omnipresent. Knowing one's resources, comparative advantage, and strategy has become standard in the U.S. and increasingly in Europe (Keller 1983; Chaffee 1985; Hearn 1988; Hardy 1990; Cameron and Tschirhart 1992; Massy 1996; Peterson et al. 1997; Clark 1998). Of course, one might argue that these principles are rendered irrelevant for public higher education, given that the market is heavily regulated by state and federal government through several types of public subsidies, restrictions in pricing, regulated degree offerings and admissions standards. Yet the industry perspective and its dominant corporate metaphor have nonetheless acquired a certain resilience, due in part to their parsimony, to today's uncritical acceptance of business and economic rhetoric, and to the very real complexity of today's campus operations. (For example, see Duderstadt's (1995) characterization of "the University of Michigan, Inc.," which with an annual budget of over \$2.5 billion would rank roughly 200th on the list of Fortune 500 companies.) In many ways, adopting business rationales with strategic management principles has become *de rigueur* for repositioning higher education organizations to compete within new economic realities.

There are several consequences, of course, to this conception of higher education coming to dominate as the legitimating idea that is used to make sense of, and ultimately to redefine the parameters of, public higher education. It is worth noting that leaders of public colleges and universities today are expected to demonstrate some willingness, if not enthusiasm, to consider market forces and demands for relevance, or else risk losing some legitimacy. However, in this conception, there is no attention to what is at stake in short-sighted adaptation to market forces; nor is there a provision for public good that may exceed the market's reach.

### *1.2. Higher education as a social institution*

I turn now to the legitimating idea of higher education as a social institution, which I argue has been gradually displaced. A social institution may be seen as an organized activity that maintains, reproduces, or adapts itself to implement values that have been widely held and firmly structured by the society. According to Turner (1997), human history is characterized by the evolution of social institutions, relatively stable and conservative in norms, structures, and general standards of good/bad, appropriate/inappropriate, worthy/unworthy, and other evaluative criteria for behavior. Over time, as institutions change, they do so in relation to one another. Turner is among those who argue that social institutions have been in a process of ongoing

differentiation with far-reaching consequences due to their interdependence with one another.

Thus, when one uses the lens of “social institution” to examine the institutional imperatives for public higher education, one sees educational organizations devoted to a wide array of social functions that have been expanded over time: the development of individual learning and human capital, the socialization and cultivation of citizens and political loyalties, the preservation of knowledge, and the fostering of other legitimate pursuits for the nation-state. It is commonly acknowledged that the decades following World War II entailed not only an expansion of higher education, but also a dramatic diversification of the activities regarded as the legitimate province of public higher education. These include educating the masses, advancing knowledge through research, contributing to economic development by employing and producing workers, and developing industrial applications. In this sense, shifts in societal imperatives reshaped expectations for higher education and redefined what activities are or are not recognized as “higher education.” Of course, such expectations and definitions continue to be reconstituted over time, at times signalling a major shift akin to the remaking of a social contract.

An additional dimension of the historical proposition warrants our consideration. As a social institution, public higher education exists in an enduring interdependence with other social institutions – not only with other levels of education, but also with the family, government, industry, religion, and popular culture. Social institutions evolve in their interchanges with one another. As Turner argues, over time, societal expectations for education in part stem from broadened expectations that it take on human capital functions, political legitimation functions, and socialization functions (1997, pp. 258–259): “Today, political leaders in industrial societies often view education as the key to economic development and political stability, since it performs such critical functions for political legitimation and for developing human capital. As education has differentiated and elaborated, many of the socialization and social-placement functions from kinship have been assumed by schools; and it has come to have increasingly far-reaching consequences for the economy (as a source of human capital and technology) and polity (as a source of political legitimation).” The relevance of this proposition for higher education, particularly for contemporary public higher education, warrants further exploration. It is entirely possible that, with the decline of public trust in social (and particularly public) institutions, there is a corresponding redefinition of expectations for public higher education as a social institution; as a result, the expected Parsonian pattern-maintenance and socialization functions may be receding, while economic functions may come to dominate the foreground.

From this perspective, it is essential to acknowledge that the terms “institution” and “organization” do not have the same meaning, even though they are often used interchangeably. While colleges and universities are frequently referred to as organizations, the use of the term “institution” is more common, often intended as a synonym, referring to organization-wide constructs such as institutional leadership, decisions, or policies. Bellah et al. (1991, p. 11) have observed that this tendency has profound consequences in that it reflects reductionist thinking, where focusing on the organization reduces complexity to the point of oversimplifying what is problematic and at the neglect of historical patterns of rights and responsibilities that shape our lives. (Another possibility is that speakers are basically unaware of the sociological distinction and its import.)

In short, the language used to talk about higher education is important, for it not only reflects our thinking but it contributes to a construction of reality. While this observation has been noted by philosophers, linguists, and sociologists alike, Bellah et al. (1991, p. 15) state it powerfully: “Institutions are very much dependent upon language: what we cannot imagine and express in language has little chance of becoming a sociological reality.” This observation carries with it even more weight when one considers the moral import. As Bellah et al. (1991, p. 11) explain, in our thinking we often neglect “the power of institutions as well as their great possibilities for good and evil;” the process of creating and recreating institutions “is never neutral, but always ethical and political.” For example, speaking of alternatives in a language of tradeoffs (such as tradeoffs between health care, prisons, higher education or other public goods) “. . . is inadequate for it suggests that the problems are merely technical, when we need a richer moral discourse with which to conduct public discussion . . .” (p. 26). Heeding Bellah et al.’s admonishment, conceptualizing higher education as subject to a logic of “social institution” invokes normative considerations. Thus, in addition to the ways that contemporary public universities and colleges are being reshaped by their environments, the very discourse about those changes and challenges itself plays a significant role in such reshaping.

It is critical to identify a distinction regarding what may have changed: Is it that the social functions of higher education may have changed, or is it that our talk and ideals about higher education have changed? That is, has public higher education taken on principally economic functions, abandoning the more comprehensive institutional mandate of performing not only educational but also socialization and political functions? Or has it become commonplace to speak of higher education in industry terms, in common parlance expecting of public colleges and universities a set of objectives that are economic (e.g., human capital, workforce training, and

economic development)? Or is it both? The distinction between the two is critical as we consider the recent past and future prospects. While changes in the social functions may signal a *de facto* shifting of the charter for public colleges and universities, the industry discourse that has come to dominate contemporary organizations reduces the scope and legitimacy of a wider range of organizations and individual academic commitments within public higher education. For example, the logic of managerial production renders irrelevant or unvalued the notion of higher education as a place for dissent and unpopular ideas, for creativity and the life of the mind, for caring and relationships, except as inefficiencies that will likely be deemed wasteful or unaffordable.

## 2. Converging mechanisms

Three interrelated mechanisms are proposed as advancing this process whereby the legitimating idea of public higher education that has come to dominate is that of an industry (rather than that of a social institution). They are: 1) academic management, 2) academic consumerism, and 3) academic stratification.

### 2.1. Academic management

The expansion in size, authority, and professionalization, of academic managers in public colleges and universities has drawn upon discourse from management science and organizational research for its ideology and position descriptions. The core premises of these literatures position campus leaders and key administrators as managers who diagnose and prescribe organizational well-being. The rationale is simple: Organizations can and do adapt, and organizational survival is dependent upon the ability of the organization to respond to its environment, which is characterized as dynamic and thus uncertain and potentially threatening. Thus, among other responsibilities, managers are expected to monitor the organization-environment interface, determine appropriate strategies, and develop effective bridging and buffering mechanisms.

When applied to the academic enterprise, campus leaders attend to both resources as well as resource relationships. The management of resources – their acquisition, maintenance and internal allocation – and the management of resource relationships between the organization and its environment – in itself becomes a major organizational practice to position their organizations for survival. (See Gumpert and Sporn (1999) for discussion of this adaptation dynamic.) Prominent examples include: monitoring vulnerabilities that

arise from resource dependence, trying to reduce existing dependencies, and meeting expectations for compliance. In the arena of public higher education, all three of these concepts have gained currency and are reflected in campus discourse and academic management rationales.

First, with regard to monitoring vulnerabilities that come from environmental turbulence, campus managers give ongoing attention to forecasting enrollment changes, shifts in state appropriations, and how such changes are handled by their peer institutions. It is essential to note that attention must be paid to multiple environments (e.g., local, state, regional, national), especially when considering those resources on which the organization has had the greatest dependence.

Second, and extremely visible in the contemporary era, is the cultivation of new resources to reduce existing dependencies. For public universities and colleges, this primarily takes the form of adopting strategies that will generate revenue for the organization – whether it be seeking to improve public relations with the state legislature, seeking out new student markets, finding new sources for research funding, stepping up efforts for alumni giving, or cultivating new sources of private revenue. The cultivation of a plurality of resources to reduce existing dependencies has long been seen as a prudent course for organizations, but has gained greater currency for public higher education in the contemporary era where dependence on funding from state appropriations has created financial challenges.

A third ongoing function of managers is to ensure compliance with demands. Various mechanisms are established to ensure and then demonstrate that an academic organization is in compliance with demands from a number of different sources, some of which are expensive for the organization. Health and safety regulations abound, for example, as both public and private universities well know. With the most recent wave of accountability extending from operations to educational functions, mandates for satisfactory compliance are often tied to state and national funding (e.g., national funds for student financial aid, state general fund appropriations for institutions, etc.) – funding that is essential to organizational survival. These initiatives range from asking public colleges and universities to demonstrate faculty productivity as well as student learning outcomes. One study documented that approximately half of the states in the U.S. have already instituted some type of performance-based funding, with twenty additional states anticipating it in the near future (Burke and Serban 1998).

The need to manage these challenges positions higher education administrators in the central mediating role of determining the potential costs and benefits of any course of action (or non-action). In so doing, administrators who occupy the most visible leadership roles in public universities and

colleges function as interpreters for the rest of the organization. They address such key concerns as: Who are the constituencies from whom the organization is seeking legitimacy and what do they want? What are successful peer institutions doing to manage contradictory demands? Can some demands be responded to symbolically, superficially, or minimally, as in a “satisficing” mode? Attending to these concerns, administrators can symbolically present the organization as responsive to a variety of external stakeholders as well as to organizational members internally. While a dissonance-free organization is unlikely to result, such efforts by managers can have powerful results in terms of securing a sense of stability as the organization navigates through times of environmental uncertainty and turbulence.

The above discussion characterized higher education managers as positioned in an expanded role, with authority over a broad domain of organizational decision-making as well as representing the organization’s purposes and priorities to the environment. This characterization contains a key premise that warrants careful scrutiny – that they are appropriately and effectively positioned to act for the organization. This premise is of course questionable. Who should speak for the organization? Under what conditions and to what extent is it appropriate to reposition the organization to meet the demands of its changing environments? While the need to manage resources and resource relationships and the need to reduce resource dependence provide a compelling post-hoc rationale for an expanded managerial domain, the role of faculty within academic governance should not be overlooked, particularly when restructuring the academic landscape of programs offered.

This critical concern falls under the general category of “the politics of professional work.” It is compatible with related critical analyses of “managerialism” (Enteman 1993) and “the emergence of technocracy” (Heydebrand 1990), a term that is intended to replace the simple bureaucracy-professionalism dualism that has previously been used to characterize academic organizations. Building on the historical argument that research universities have become more entrepreneurial through increased academic capitalism, scholars have proposed that research universities have become more managerial in their governance and the division of labor (Rhoades and Slaughter 1997). In particular, as Rhoades (1998) has proposed, faculty have become “managed professionals,” while middle-level administrators have become “managerial professionals.” While changes in the power dynamics remain for empirical study, the trend toward increased formalization and evaluation of faculty work is clear. Management has assumed more organizational space and visibility in running the enterprise.

This notion has obvious relevance for the full range of U.S. public colleges and universities as well. A key rationale for this shift in authority to academic managers has been the need for flexibility to adapt swiftly and a concomitant need for discretion over resource reallocation and programmatic investment. However, the consequences for the organization are, of course, profound, as such centralized decisions determine where and how the organization will invest its academic resources and ultimately possible change in the very character of the enterprise. This includes such defining practices as selecting among academic priorities, eliminating or making the case to eliminate or downsize academic programs, and determining the academic workforce and its characteristics (e.g., full-time vs. part-time, course load, etc.). Critics of this expansion in managerial authority and its ensuing consequences have suggested that environmental conditions should not predetermine such academic restructuring. For example, in questioning the presumption that managerialism is a natural academic adaptation, Rhoades and Slaughter (1997, p. 33) argue: "The structural patterns we describe are not just inexorable external developments to which colleges and universities are subject and doomed. . . . The academy itself daily enacts and expresses social relations of capitalism and heightened managerial control grounded in a neo-conservative discourse." Thus, they make explicit a mechanism that has contributed to displacing organizational practices that advocated for preserving educational legacies where human development and citizenship were central imperatives alongside a full range of knowledge areas that were supported for reasons other than their anticipated human capital or market value.

## 2.2. *Academic consumerism*

A second mechanism that has contributed to the legitimating idea of public higher education as an industry is the sovereignty of the consumer. The rise of academic consumerism can be seen as a phenomenon that has emerged after the post-World War II decades of massification and its attendant democratic gains. The conceptual shift elevates consumer interests as paramount considerations in the restructuring of academic programs and the reengineering of academic services.

The needs and interests of several types of consumers (e.g., taxpayers, employers, research funders, students) come to mind, when considering who public universities and colleges serve. However, it is most commonly the student-as-consumer of public higher education, and particularly the student as potential or current employee who seeks workforce training or economic security.

The rise of academic consumerism in the contemporary era has been accelerated by four essential presumptions, although each is problematic in its own way.

First, the student-consumer is presumed to be capable of informed choice, with the ability to pay (Readings 1996). To view prospective students as prospective buyers conjures up the image of the smartest shoppers among them perusing *Consumer Reports*, as one would when considering the purchase of an automobile or major household appliance. The premise is that the intelligent consumer will select that which has the best value for the money. While in itself the spirit of this premise is not unsound, in practice the U. S. higher education system has no such organizational performance data available; in fact, campuses themselves have been resistant to such attempts, even as they are vocal in their criticism of the widely-cited *US News and World Report* rankings.

A second and related presumption is that the enrolled student-consumer is assumed to have chosen to attend that particular college or university. This would be consistent with the economic theory of revealed preferences whereby behaviors are seen as matching desires. Thus, a student who has enrolled at a community college wanted to go there because it maximized his or her utility, rather than as a result of socialization, truncated aspirations, socioeconomic barriers, or a discriminatory culture.

Third, enrolled students-consumers are "... encouraged to think of themselves as consumers of services rather than as members of a community," as Readings (1996, p. 11) insightfully observed. Campus administrators and faculty may even be encouraged to think of students as consumers too. The basis for exchange is the delivery of an academic service (e.g., lecture, course, piece of advice). This conception of students drastically reduces the potential richness of teaching and learning relationships, inclinations toward mentoring and sponsorship, and students forging meaningful bonds with their peers. In effect, it would place an emphasis on the campus as a business of academic transactions rather than as a community of inquirers, teachers and learners.

Fourth, consumer taste and satisfaction can become elevated to new heights in the minds of those responsible for designing academic services and programs. The translation of this presumption into practice can be seen in the vocationalization of academic programs that seem to be altered as easily as changing the time that courses are offered or rushing to establish them on-line. It is also evident in the academic quality movement, which places a premium on customer satisfaction. While attention to student needs and preferences is not by any means inherently misguided, it is the *reduction* of students to consumers in this way and the supremacy of presumed consumer

interests in academic restructuring that may cumulatively do the educational enterprise a disservice.

In this way, consumer taste rather than professional expertise may become the basis for legitimate change in public higher education. As such academic consumerism would increasingly dictate the character of the academic enterprise, as public colleges and universities cater to the desires of the individual (short-sighted though they may be), thereby further displacing faculty authority and perhaps ultimately the collective force of diverse educational legacies.

### *2.3. Academic stratification*

The third mechanism entails a re-stratification of academic subjects and academic personnel, based upon the increased use-value of particular knowledges in the wider society and exchange-value in certain markets. The increased use-value of knowledge is evident in both the culture of ideas and the commerce of ideas, defining features at the heart of postindustrial society (Bartley 1990; Drucker 1993; Gibbons et al. 1994; Slaughter and Leslie 1997). The culture of ideas acknowledges an accumulated heritage of knowledge accepted by society, sometimes seen as a storehouse or stock of knowledge with shared understandings and values. From this perspective, public colleges and universities may be seen as social organizations of knowledge that contribute to society in the Durkheimian sense of integration. Similarly, the commerce of ideas casts a spotlight on the creation and distribution of ideas in the knowledge industry as well as on the growing exchange-value of knowledges in specific markets. From this perspective, public colleges and universities – particularly research universities – may also be seen as competitors in the commercial activities of publications and copyrights, patents and licenses, positioning themselves and the nation for global competitiveness. Such knowledge activities have, on some campuses, come to be seen as essential – even increasingly, as core – pursuits of public colleges and universities. (And, in addition, this is quite compatible with the revenue-generating aspirations of academic managers, as discussed above.)

In order to grasp the full import of this idea, higher education needs to be understood primarily as a knowledge-processing system. This stands in contrast to the conventional view that characterizes higher education as a people-processing system in which goals, structures, and outcomes support students undergoing personality development, learning skills, and acquiring credentials that may enable upward mobility. In posing the alternative – that higher education has central knowledge functions – knowledge is then seen as the defining core of academic work and academic workers. As Clark (1983) insightfully explains, knowledge is “the prime material around which activity

is organized . . . Knowledge materials, and advanced ones at that, are at the core of any higher education system's purposes and essence. This holds true throughout history and across societies as well" (1983, p. 13). Following Meyer (1977), Clark suggests that knowledge is processed so as to have a wide array of intellectual, professional, economic and social consequences: "As educational institutions in general evolve, they develop categories of knowledge and thereby determine that certain types of knowledge exist and are authoritative. They also define categories of persons privileged to possess the bodies of knowledge and to exercise the authority that comes from knowledge. Educational structures, in effect, are a theory of knowledge, in that they help define what currently counts as knowledge" (1983, p. 26). Clark (1996, pp. 429–420) has since developed the conception even further by prescribing that universities, as "knowledge-based institutions," should be more conscious of possibilities for risk-taking investment in new fields along with recombinations of old fields; with optimism regarding as-of-yet unrealized potential, he proposes that "certain ways of organizing knowledge offer the possibility of sustained insight, even to the point of a systematic claim on wisdom." Although gains in insight and wisdom have indisputable significance for society, neither one has yet made it onto the report card of organizational performance indicators. Nonetheless, we continue to see self-described strategic efforts to reorganize academic areas in public universities and colleges.

An instrumental orientation toward academic knowledge also seems widespread in the contemporary era. The notions of knowledge as a public good and academic knowledge as a free market of ideas seem increasingly unsustainable in a context where academic subjects and knowledge workers are not buffered from market forces. Given the realities of complex organizations, where resource acquisition and status considerations abound, these developments also have consequences for the stratified social order on campuses. In the contemporary era, academic knowledge areas require capital for fuel and the promise of future resources for sustained legitimacy. The resource requirements of knowledge areas and the likelihood of generating revenue have a salience that cannot be overstated, so much so, that today's knowledge creation and management may be interpreted as increasingly dominated by a proprietary ethic in the spirit of advanced capitalism. This characterization may be problematic for some, in that it uses predominately the managerial metaphor to talk about higher education in terms of entrepreneurial dynamics that can help a campus sustain its inventory and pursue its core competencies (Prahalad and Hamel 1990). However, in the present era, the resource requirements of creating, sustaining and extending knowledge activ-

ities figure prominently in campus deliberations over what academically is worthy of support.

Selection processes are at work to determine what knowledge is considered most valuable and hence worthy of support. As an illustration, consider the ways in which state governments conceptualize public higher education as services to procure. Particularly in the past fifteen years, we see evidence of a willingness to support (i.e. allocate financial resources to) public universities to procure teaching (and where applicable, research) services. This procurement orientation suggests an underlying production function approach, where higher education is valued for its instrumental contributions vis-à-vis the preparation and retraining of individuals for work and the application of useful knowledge to social and economic needs, rather than one in which all fields of study have inherent worth. In this sense, the context quite directly shapes what knowledge is considered to have value for instruction, research or service. Conversely, the context neglects – or perhaps actively dismantles – those areas not valued. In this way, the context alters the academic landscape and its knowledge areas, and public universities themselves come to internalize this conception (see, e.g., NASULGC 1997).<sup>2</sup>

Selection processes are also at work given external demands for managers to reshape the structure of the academic landscape. Evidence suggests that academic re-organization in times of resource constraint differs from the differentiation that accompanies expansion along with stratification of academic subjects and personnel (Blau 1970, 1973; Clark 1983, 1993; Gumpert 1993; Metzger 1987; Rhoades and Slaughter 1997). Thus, what has come to count as knowledge has not simply unfolded or evolved out of existing areas, but has resulted in part from the differential valuing and resourcing of academic units competing for epistemological, organizational, and physical space. When additive solutions have not been possible, priorities are identified; particular units are constructed as failing to pull their weight, and are targeted for downsizing and elimination. For example, small humanities programs (such as foreign languages) have been losing resources and status.

In the contemporary era, the rhetoric of selective reinvestment has gained ascendancy, while comprehensive field coverage is increasingly considered not viable for every campus, something that not every university can afford or aspire to – due to budget and management considerations. The discourse of restructuring for selective reinvestment on campuses is a marked departure from comprehensive field coverage, and it directly parallels the discussions to maximize one's comparative advantage that dominates corporate approaches. In contrast, the histories of many of this country's public colleges and universities suggest that they were established with the ideal of openness to all

knowledge, regardless of immediate applications and relevance. Thus, it used to be assumed that access to the full range of knowledge is desirable, and that higher education is the appropriate gateway to that reservoir. However, in the contemporary era, an era in which comprehensiveness is not a widespread option, academic reorganization is cast as a set of budget issues and a management problem, albeit with educational implications. Such restructuring limits the scope of academic knowledge that students are offered on any given campus, with the longer range potential of further stratifying who learns what. (An interesting irony of course is seen in the ascendancy of the Internet which promises access to everything.)

At the same time, new forms of collaboration have been proposed as a partial antidote to the narrowing of subject matter. In one historical case study of academic planning in a state university system (Gumport 1994), an official from the university's systemwide office explained the need to depart from the ideal of comprehensiveness in order to facilitate consolidation and urged the campuses to share resources with one another in an unprecedented cooperation:

Despite the great need for economies in [our academic programs] and for directed applications of knowledge, the University and its publics should reaffirm the principle of the pursuit of knowledge irrespective of its immediate applications. Intrinsic to the idea of the university is that, in principle, no corner of knowledge should remain unexplored. It is equally clear, however, that this ideal, while remaining a principle for our University as a whole, is not viable as a principle for each campus. The idea of a general campus implies the capacity to cover those subjects necessary for a liberal arts education and to sustain subjects (such as mathematics and computer science) that are necessary to sustain different kinds of research. But it cannot imply that every campus develop every research and teaching program that the pursuit of knowledge and the impetus to excellence might suggest. Given that constraint, it is evident that each campus of the University should specialize in some ways, and that such specialization should be coordinated. Coordination would permit and encourage innovative and cutting-edge programs to develop, but would also control excess provision and unnecessary duplication in the interests of economy. Furthermore, access of students and faculty to highly specialized programs could be augmented by designing them on an intercampus or regional basis, by permitting students to move more freely through programs of campus interchange and by other institutional and technological inventions.

It remains to be seen whether campuses that comprise a public system can be prodded into cooperation by such top-down pleas for “one system thinking.” At the very least, it runs directly counter to the competitive dynamic that is ingrained in the academic socialization of some faculty.

It also remains to be seen whether campuses will become increasingly divided by contemporary initiatives, such as responsibility-centered budgeting and the pursuit of selective excellence where the paramount consideration is the revenue-generating capability of discrete academic units and their proximity to thriving industries, such as software and microelectronics. The longer-range consequences, of course, are not just organizational but institutional, as the dominant institutional logic is reconstituted. As knowledge is seen as a source of wealth, it is increasingly constructed as a private good rather than a public good. The commodification of knowledge proceeds alongside negotiations over the ownership of knowledge and is refined in policies for intellectual property rights and responsibilities. Market-consciousness of knowledge outputs and property rights is bound to constrain teaching and research, and perhaps even thinking, in public higher education.

### **3. Managing for legitimacy**

One consequence of these converging forces is that the management of public higher education institutions faces formidable legitimacy challenges, where reconciling competing institutional logics is difficult. The tensions are evident in academic restructuring dynamics on different types of campuses.

The central balancing act in contemporary academic restructuring is that of adequately responding to seemingly irreconcilable expectations, when to make gains in one dimension may mean loss in another. For example, achieving strategic positioning in new knowledge markets may yield immediate gains for a campus in generating resources but a loss of moral legitimacy, core purposes and values such that it is no longer recognizable and identified as the entity that it was expected to be. Alternatively, a campus could have all the legitimacy it can muster and no revenue, and thereby go out of business. Thus, organizational repositioning is a complex matter, not reducible to strategic prescriptions or technical manipulation. Particularly for public colleges and universities, repositioning with respect to contemporary environmental demands is difficult – not only in terms of determining how to reconcile conflicting demands, but also in terms of determining the extent to which the organization can respond to demands that threaten its survival. The question of whether or not the organization *can* respond should be preceded by the question of whether or not it *should* respond to whatever is demanded

by the resource relationships on which it depends, for an entirely different kind of organization may result.

For example, consider a situation in which both a local community college and a liberal arts college are facing demands to offer more vocationally-oriented programs, including electronic access through expanded distance learning programs. It is prudent for the community college to do so, given that those community colleges nationwide which are perceived to be cutting edge are offering such programs and advertising through relevant media that they can enthusiastically and swiftly accommodate these demands. For the liberal arts college, however, the path is not clear. While some liberal arts colleges may come to add professional or vocationally-oriented programs, the bulk of the academic program cannot shift too far afield from its institutional charter to provide liberal education. In fact, the institutional unwillingness to offer such programs may earn it greater legitimacy within a smaller, selective, elite niche for holding steadfast to its commitment to distinctive core values. In this situation, it would be prudent to see what its peer institutions are doing, in particular its most successful peers. One organizational study has documented both the trend and the peer effect: the proportion of professional and vocational majors graduating from non-selective liberal arts colleges has skyrocketed (Zammuto 1984). However, another study documented the trend in vocationalization, but no peer effect, suggesting that the colleges in the study did not mimic their peers and suffered no loss of legitimacy (Kraatz and Zajac 1996). Perhaps the major implication to draw from these studies is that predictions about ensuing legitimacy must take into account the history as well as present context along with its stock of legitimacy. With this in mind, one can predict whether a campus is particularly vulnerable and in need of repairing its legitimacy or is riding high and likely to be resilient. (For discussion of legitimacy, see Suchman 1995.)

However, managing legitimacy challenges cannot be reduced to a simple calculation or weighing discrete tradeoffs. Acknowledging public higher education's institutional legacies, the full range of expectations must be considered along with their moral import. Consider for example, the commonly-cited array of demands on public higher education: to reduce or contain costs, to improve teaching and learning, to remain technologically cutting edge, and to expand access. The demand to reduce or cut costs can be achieved in several ways – by streamlining, budget discipline, elimination of programs that are not cost-effective, not investing in expensive ventures, or trying to achieve economies of scale. Improvement of teaching and learning may be achieved by reducing class size, providing more faculty attention to individual students, obtaining more state-of-the-art equipment, or enhancing the learning environments. Similarly, upgrading technology

may entail major overhauls of the organizational infrastructure and access to information systems in addition to providing students and faculty with the training to use it. Finally, expanding access may involve admitting students who are academically under-prepared and in need of expanded and extensive remedial programs across subject matters. Accomplishing any one of these four would be an outstanding feat, while achieving two or more in a resource-constrained environment is unlikely. The demands in themselves are not at cross-purposes, but the strategies for responding to them simultaneously may be costly and in conflict. Thus, challenge for public higher education's leaders in the U.S. is to invite collective deliberation over appropriate responses – not only at the campus level, but at state and national levels as well. And the challenge for the rest of us is to participate actively and critically in these determinations. Given the decentralized structure of U.S. higher education, few forums exist for such purposeful discussion of the cumulative impact of local academic restructuring.

In the absence of such collective deliberations, I see an ongoing struggle, where public higher education is increasingly using market discourse and managerial approaches to restructure in an attempt to gain legitimacy; yet, in so doing, they may end up *losing* legitimacy by changing their business practices to such a degree that they move away from their historical character, functions, and accumulated heritage as educational institutions. In this sense, it may be argued that adapting to short-term economic exigencies may be harmful for public higher education, as it subsumes the campus-by-campus discourse about prospective futures within a logic of economic rationality.

It is entirely possible that no loss of legitimacy will result, if the multiple institutional logics can be made compatible through superficial conformity, loose coupling or buffering. Empirical research needs to examine the conditions in which these dynamics are played out, as well as how institutional logics are reconstituted, including whether organizational actors can participate as purposive challengers or only as passive carriers of institutional scripts.

## **Conclusion**

Those who grapple with contemporary reform dilemmas in the public higher education system must necessarily reflect upon histories as well as futures, what Kerr (1987, p. 183) has called “accumulated heritage versus modern imperatives.” As Kerr (p. 184) has asserted, the “confrontation” between the past and the future results in a tension that is so profound that the current era is “*the* greatest critical age” for higher education in industrialized nations. This confrontation is characterized by a simultaneous call for protection and for

redefinition. On the one hand, there is a call to protect: How can higher education protect its legacy, including decades of public investment in an enterprise whose strengths must not be diluted or deteriorated for short-term market demands? On the other hand, there is a call to respond: How can higher education redefine itself to attend to the signals of those it is supposed to serve? Several observers of contemporary calls for change share Kerr's observation that this historical moment is a defining moment for higher education, perhaps as significant as the late 19th century transformations (Clark 1998; Marchese 1998; Noll 1998).

In the process of rapidly assimilating concepts from managerial approaches and bolstered by concepts from management science, contemporary public colleges and universities are at risk for losing sight of the historical record that they are more to society than organizations *per se*, and that prescriptions for their management must not be reduced to technical organizational imperatives. There are those who believe that this discourse is merely the fashion of the moment. I however suggest that the discourse has a deeper significance – just as the ebb of poetry, manners, and Truth signal important changes at the societal level. Unfettered organizational imperatives have the potential to run wild in public colleges and universities – free of content, history and values, without regard to their accumulated heritage as particular types of social institutions, within yet not entirely of society, with educational legacies grounded in the centrality of knowledge and democratic values. To guard against this, I suggest that contemporary academic restructuring be viewed not only as organizational change but also as institutional change. And as such, we need to pause and reflect on the cumulative record of the recent past.

We are witnessing a reshaping of the institutional purposes of public higher education: in its people-processing activities as well as its knowledge-processing. The change entails not only what knowledges are deemed worthy but also who has access to and ownership of them. The converse must be considered as well. Furthermore, as is the case when there is a deviation from accumulated heritage, questions of moral import arise that warrant explicit deliberation. For example, should public colleges and universities primarily serve the needs of the economy, and in so doing see its customers as students/employees? If so, will core educational and socialization functions be redistributed among other social institutions – such as the family, religion, or the media – that already serve in part to fulfill some of these functions? Can public universities sustain knowledge transmission, production and creation as compatible activities? Or will each set of activities in their own way become privatized? Who will judge the academic worth of specific subjects – faculty, students, state legislators, employers? I raise these issues in the

spirit of considering unintended consequences in a Mertonian sense as well as reflecting upon the cumulative impact of the ways we talk and the ways we think about the settings in which we study and work.

## Note

1. The development of this thesis has an empirical counterpart in my case study research on public colleges and universities in the U.S. (Gumport 1993, 1994, 1997, 1998; Gumport and Pusser 1999). This article puts forward some key conceptual distinctions. They are stated as propositional, even though I believe evidence abounds that may serve as descriptive substantiation; and I restrict them to the domain of public higher education in the U.S., which is the focus of my empirical work-in-progress, even though they may have relevance for higher education in other settings.
2. Examples of such state-level restructuring initiatives were seen in several states in the 1990s: over 80 academic programs were eliminated in Virginia; over 70 were eliminated or consolidated in Massachusetts (Gumport and Pusser 1999). Significant cost savings can result, as seen in Illinois public universities where 300 programs were eliminated, reduced or consolidated, for a savings of \$181 million, and in Illinois community colleges where the same occurred 335 programs and a savings of \$209 million; in each case, the savings were reallocated to salaries or new programs (IBHE 1998).

## References

- Bartley, W.W. (1990). *Unfathomed Knowledge, Unmeasured Wealth: On Universities and the Wealth of Nations*. La Salle, IL: Open Court Press.
- Bellah, R.N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A. and Tipton, S.M. (1991). *The Good Society*. New York, NY: Random House Books.
- Blau, P. (1970). 'A formal theory of differentiation in organizations', *American Sociological Review* 35, 201–218.
- Blau, P. (1973). *The Organization of Academic Work*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Burke, J.C. and Serban, A. (eds.) (1998). 'Performance funding for public higher education', in *New Directions for Institutional Research*, Number 97 (Spring). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cameron, K.S. and Tschirhart, M. (1992). 'Postindustrial environments and organizational effectiveness in colleges and universities', *Journal of Higher Education* 63, 87–108.
- Chaffee, E.E. (1985). 'The concept of strategy: From business to higher education', in Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Volume I. New York: Agathon.
- Clark, B.R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1993). 'The problem of complexity in modern higher education', in Rothblatt, S. and Wittrock, B. (eds.), *The European and American University Since 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, B.R. (1996). 'Substantive growth and innovative organization', *Higher Education* 32(4), 417–430.

- Clark, B.R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Surrey, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Dill, D. and Sporn, B. (eds.) (1995). *Emerging Patterns of Social Demand and University Reform: Through a Glass Darkly*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Drucker, P.F. (1993). *Post-Capitalist Society*. New York, NY: Harper Collins Books.
- Duderstadt, J. (1995). 'Academic renewal at Michigan', in Meyerson, J. and Massy, W. (eds.), *Revitalizing Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.
- Durkheim, E. (1933). *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Enteman, W.F. (1993). *Managerialism: The Emergence of a New Ideology*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P. and Trow, M. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamic of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gumport, P.J. (1993). 'The contested terrain of academic program reduction', *The Journal of Higher Education* 64, 283–311.
- Gumport, P.J. (1994). 'Academic Restructuring in Historical Perspective: Shifting Priorities in the University of California'. Presented at Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting (November). Tucson, AZ.
- Gumport, P.J. (1997). 'Public universities as academic workplaces', *Daedalus (Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences)* (Fall) 126(4), 113–136.
- Gumport, P.J. (1998). 'Academic restructuring in public higher education: A framework and research agenda', *Technical Report Number NCPI-1130 for the U.S. Department of Education*. Grant #R309A60001. Stanford, CA: National Center for Postsecondary Improvement.
- Gumport, P.J. and Pusser, B. (1999). 'University restructuring: The role of economic and political contexts', in Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Volume XIV. Bronx, NY: Agathon Press, pp. 146–200.
- Gumport, P.J. and Sporn, B. (1999). 'Institutional adaptation: Demands for management reform and university administration', in Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Volume XIV. Bronx, NY: Agathon Press, pp. 103–145.
- Hammer, M. and Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Hardy, C. (1990). '“Hard” decisions and “tough” choices: The business approach to university decline', *Higher Education* 20, 301–321.
- Hearn, J.C. (1988). 'Strategy and resources: Economic issues in strategic planning and management in higher education', in Smart, J. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Volume IV. New York: Agathon.
- Heydebrand, W. (1990). 'The technocratic organization of academic work', in Calhoun, C., Meyer, M.W. and Scott, W.R. (eds.), *Structures of Power and Constraint: Papers in Honor of Peter M. Blau*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- IBHE (Illinois Board of Higher Education) (1998). 'Results and benefits of PQP', in *Progress report* (March) IL: Springfield.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kerr, C. (1987). 'A critical age in the university world: Accumulated heritage versus modern imperatives', *European Journal of Education* 22(2), 183–193.
- Kerr, C. (1995 [Orig. 1963]). *The Uses of the University*, 4th Edn. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kraatz, M. and Zajac, E. (1996). 'Exploring the limits of the new institutionalism: The causes and consequences of illegitimate organizational change', *American Sociological Review* 61 (October), 812–836.
- Marchese, T. (1998). 'Not-so-distant competitors: How new providers are remaking the postsecondary marketplace', *AAHE Bulletin* 50(9) (May).
- Massy, W.F. (1996). 'Productivity in higher education', in Massy, W.F. (ed.), *Resource Allocation in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Metzger, W.P. (1987). 'The academic profession in the United States', in Clark, B. (ed.), *The Academic Profession: National, Disciplinary, and Institutional Settings*. Berkeley, CA: The University of California Press.
- Meyer, J.W. (1977). 'The effects of education as an institution', *American Journal of Sociology* 83, 55–77.
- NASULGC (1997). *Value Added – The Economic Impact of Public Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (December).
- Neave, G. and van Vught, F. (eds.) (1991). *Prometheus Bound: The Changing Relationship between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Noll, R.G. (ed.) (1998). *Challenges to Research Universities*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press.
- Peterson, M.W., Dill, D. and Mets, L.A. (eds.) (1997). *Planning and Management for a Changing Environment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Pew (1993a). 'A call to meeting', in *Policy Perspectives*. Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pew (1993b). 'A transatlantic dialogue', in *Policy Perspectives*. Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pew (1993c). 'An uncertain terrain', in *Policy Perspectives*. Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Pew (1994). 'To Dance with Change', in *Policy Perspectives*. Institute for Research on Higher Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Prahalad, C.K. and Hamel, G. (1990). 'The core competence of the corporation', *Harvard Business Review* 68, 79–91.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rhoades, G.L. (1998). *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Rhoades, G.L. and Slaughter, S. (1997). 'Academic capitalism, managed professionals, and supply-side higher education', *Social Text* 15(2), 11–38.
- Seymour, D.T. (1992). *On Q: Causing Quality in Higher Education*. New York, NY: American Council on Education, Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L.L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Suchman, M. (1995). 'Managing legitimacy', *Academy of Management Review* 20(3), 571–610.
- Turner, J.H. (1997). *The Institutional Order: Economy, Kinship, Religion, Polity, Law, and Education in Evolutionary and Comparative Perspective*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Zammuto, R.F. (1984). 'Are the liberal arts an endangered species?', *Journal of Higher Education* 55(2), 184–211.
- Zemsky, R. and Massy, W.F. (1990). 'Cost containment: Committing to a new economic reality', *Change* 22(6), 16–22.

