9

Managerialism, Internationalization, Taylorization and the Deskilling of Academic Work: Evidence from an Australian University

Jan Schapper and Susan Mayson

Introduction

Australian universities have undergone very substantial change over the last ten to fifteen years. Globalization and its attendant forces for internationalizing education, technological change enabling mass delivery of education and shifts in political ideology surrounding the governance and funding of higher education have wrought changes to the structure and context of academic work. It is within this context that we, and others before us (see for example, Deem 2001, Marginson & Considine 2000, Marginson 2002, Welch 1998), point to effects of managerialism and internationalization on academic institutions and those who work within them. The erosion of academic freedoms, alienation from university decision-making processes, accompanied by large class sizes, student diversity and the administrative and pedagogical demands of new modes of curricula delivery, characterize the academic's everyday working environment.

As academics we reflect on the impact of these forces for change on our working lives and on our roles as teachers and researchers. We are not alone in our reflections. A growing number of papers and studies document the many ways in which the university experience of students, academic and administrative staff has been radically transformed (see, for example Barry, Chandler & Clark 2001, Coaldrake 1999, Deem 2001, Marginson 2000a, Parker & Jary 1995). Much about the changes in higher education brought about by managerialism and internationalization is to be applauded. Many papers celebrate the opportunities and practice of what is variously called multicultural, cross-cultural, intercultural, or culturally inclusive education in universities (see Beamer 1992, Gudykunst & Kim 1997, Peoples Wessinger 1994, Prescott & Hellstén this volume). And, while managerialism or, to

P. Ninnes and M. Hellstén (eds.), Internationalizing Higher Education, 181-197.

use Welch's (1998: 4) phrase, the "cult of efficiency" has its critics (see for example, Bellamy, Morley & Watty 2003, Marginson & Considine 2000, Parker & Jary 1995, Welch 1998, Winter, Taylor & Sarros 2000), managerialist policies and practices have fostered more effective and transparent management practices within our universities. For example, recently introduced human resource management policies and procedures such as performance management criteria and workloads models provide criteria for transparent performance measures and allocation of work.

As we prepared for this chapter we noted that although we shared many of the sentiments of the critics of internationalization and managerialism, we felt that too much of the generalized commentary surrounding internationalization sanitized the realities faced by academic staff engaged in implementing an internationalized curriculum in a large Australian university. Although words such as "massification" (Coaldrake 1999, Scott 1998), the "homogenisation" of curriculum (Marginson 2000a, 2000b) and the "commodified curriculum" (Lewis 1998, Welch 2002) resonate with our recent experiences, they do not adequately capture the grinding and intellectually deskilling circumstances faced by academics, at least in our university and within our Department. We are struck by what we experience as the very normative idealizations provided by supporters of internationalized curriculum development and think it worthwhile to provide some details of our experience of internationalization. In the spirit of adding to the intellectual debate on internationalization of higher education we invite comment not necessarily on our current practise but on the context and practices through which internationalization is planned, developed and implemented.

In this chapter, we begin by describing the context in which we work and argue that internationalization and managerialism have transformed academic work in ways that devalue academics' contribution to teaching and learning and threaten academic autonomy. In order to make sense of our experience and the broader changes that shape the context in which we work, we draw on our discipline of management to describe what we call the 'Taylorization' of academic work. We outline Frederick Taylor's principles of scientific management and argue that the growing trend towards centralized management decision making and standardization, key elements of Taylor's scientific management, are readily identified in the pedagogical processes and expected academic practices in higher education. We illustrate our arguments and the utility of the 'Taylorization' framework by presenting a case study constructed from our experience as participants in one of our university's projects to develop and deliver an internationalized common curriculum to students in Asia, South Africa and Australia. Finally, as a way forward we offer some insights from the internationalization literature that provides a pedagogically focused and inclusive approach to developing internationalization strategies.

The Context: Internationalization, Managerialism and Higher Education

Internationalization and managerialism are highlighted in the literature as two fundamental forces for change in Western universities across the globe (Marginson 2002, Marginson & Considine 2000, Deem 2001). While these forces for change have operated in tandem within universities in recent times, many writers interested in analysing the effects of neo-conservative ideologies in higher education institutions and the rise of managerial power in universities have done so without reference to particular kinds of strategies developed by university decision-makers (see for example Bellamy, Morely & Watty 2003, Winter, Taylor & Sarros 2000, c.f. Welch 1998). For the purposes of our chapter, we see internationalization and managerialism as two powerful and intersecting forces that shape academic work in higher education.

Internationalization is not new to Australian universities (Knight & de Wit 1995, Welch & Denman 1997). From the 1950s onward, foreign affairs initiatives and aid programs opened Australian universities up to international students from across the Commonwealth through government hosting and scholarship schemes. In the late 1980s access to Australian higher education broadened when the Government abolished aid-based educational programs and permitted universities to charge full-fees to overseas students (Marginson 1997, 2000b). Internationalization is now a strategic corporate activity for Australian universities that provides an important source of non-government funding and the capacity for universities to expand activities across national borders (Welch 2002). Australia is currently the third largest provider of university education for overseas students after the United States and the United Kingdom, and overseas students represent one-fifth of total enrolment of students in Australian universities (Marginson 2002).

While Australian universities continue to intensify their engagement with external markets, various writers point to the contradictory nature of globalization and the ways in which interdependent global systems have shaped institutional responses to global and local markets in education (Marginson 1997, 2000a, 2000b, Marginson & Considine 2000, Porter & Vidovich 2000). Most significantly, there have been profound changes to university structures and governance and a reshaping of academic work brought about by the ways in which universities responded to the opportunities and threats presented by global education markets (Marginson 2000a, Marginson & Considine 2000, Porter & Vidovich 2000, Rizvi & Walsh 1998, Welch & Denman 1997).

For the purposes of our argument we highlight the influence of managerialist practices and values in the development of internationalization strategies. For example, the tendency towards the 'massification' of education is not just an institutional response to falling government support for university activities and universities' need for rapid growth and global integration into world-wide economic, cultural and knowledge systems in order to maintain competitive advantage in global education markets (Marginson 2000a, 2000b, Marginson & Considine 2000, Porter & Vidovich 2000, Scott 1998). It is a response based on the demands and requirements of

managerialism in terms of effectiveness and efficiency and the need to measure broad outcomes across a range of standardized activities. Within this context, universities face contradictory tendencies. They must market and deliver their educational services across the globe while simultaneously accommodating diverse, localized and de-centred needs of specific student groups. In order to participate in these markets, universities, such as the one we work for, respond most readily to universalizing forces by relying on modes of economic rationality such as centralized strategic planning (supported by centralized government planning and policy) and economies of scale to maintain competitive advantage in markets which are themselves very localized and de-centred (Pratt & Poole 1999/2000, Welch & Denman 1997). Education becomes a commodity (see Lewis 1998), delivered to 'customers' in rationalized and economical ways, with only lip service paid to the learning outcomes or educational objectives of diverse student groups (see also Jamieson & Naidoo this volume).

Managerialism and the influence of new public management practices in the higher education sector have operated in tandem with internationalization as a fundamental force for change in modern universities in Australia and the UK (Barry, Chandler & Clark 2001, Bellamy, Morley & Watty 2003, Deem 2001, Marginson & Considine 2000, Winter, Taylor & Sarros 2000). The rise of managerialist ideology and increased power of university managers has created an alienated and demoralized academic workforce and a climate of resentment and resistance, even among academics who have become academic managers and who have benefited from managerialist policies (Bellamy et al. 2003, Chandler, Barry & Clark 2002, Gleeson & Shain 1999, Taylor, Gough, Bundrock & Winter 1998). From the perspective of these writers, managerialism has centralized decision-making, increased workloads, fragmented work tasks and diminished academic autonomy by alienating academics from the decision making structures within universities (see also Coaldrake & Stedman 1999).

Addressing the shift to the managerialist or corporate approach to higher education, Marginson and Considine (2000: 5) provide an insight into the purpose and ethos of what they have termed the "Enterprise University":

> In the Enterprise University, the economic and academic dimensions are both subordinated to something else. Money is a key objective, but it is also the means to a more fundamental mission: to advance the prestige and competitiveness of the university as an end in itself. At the same time, academic identities, in their variations, are subordinated to the mission, marketing and strategic development of the institution and its leaders.

The Enterprise University represents a "reworked" university structure (Pratt & Poole 1999/2000: 18) which is reliant on entrepreneurial activities, centralized planning and an increasingly independent (of government and collegial control) corporate structure (Marginson & Considine 2000, Pratt & Poole 1999/2000, Welch &

Denman 1997, Welch 2002). Academics are squeezed by the competing demands of entrepreneurial marketing and quality educational outcomes and academic standards (Bellamy et al. 2003, Chandler et al. 2002, Welch 1998, Winter et al. 2000).

Such universities rely on the flexibility of personnel and resources (Marginson & Considine 2002). As academics, flexibility means increased demands on our time but with limited access to scarce departmental resources to support our international activities. For example, in our experience the role of 'travelling faculty', which potentially provides valuable international experience and enhances our ability to deliver an internationalized curriculum (see also Welch & Denman 1997), is not shared across all staff that have international responsibilities. And, for those academics that do travel at the university's expense, concerns of efficiency and effectiveness over-ride the needs of the travelling academic and the provision of quality teaching outcomes. For many travelling staff the hours are long with an expectation of multiskilling. Not only must they teach, they also engage in marketing and recruitment activities at education fairs. Despite the importance of these roles to the university's future enrolments (and business), our experience tells us there is little provision of intercultural training or training in student selection methods. Development of flexibility might be the key to an enterprise university's success in maintaining its market share but the pressures for flexibility clearly exploit the goodwill of academic staff.

Those academics whose productive time is filled with either administrative demands or international travel find it increasingly difficult to engage in research (Pratt & Poole 1999/2000). University entrepreneurial activities encourage a shift away from basic research to more lucrative commercial consulting activities and links with industry to increase revenue flows and institutional prestige (Marginson & Considine 2000, Pratt & Poole 1999/2000). Academic involvement in these activities comes with a cost of added stress and time pressures leading to less time spent preparing for teaching, less personal time and scarce academic resources being consumed on non-academic activities.

Not surprisingly, the shift from local academic autonomy to corporate control has created a climate of academic discontent within universities (Coaldrake 1999, Taylor et al. 1998, Welch 2002). Internationalization of Australian higher education along with the introduction of managerialist practices has challenged and changed university structures, the nature of academic work and the meaning of what it is to be an academic. As Marginson and Considine (2000) and others argue, 'Enterprise Universities' seek to maintain their competitive advantage in global education markets by developing universalized and commodified mass education programs. Driven by market forces with an emphasis on cost minimization these programs cannot adequately serve the diverse needs of international student groups (Welch 2002). The effect of these changes on academic work is profound. Academic autonomy is lost as courses are developed and marketed centrally. Identities as academics are under constant challenge as academic staff take on multiple and often conflicting roles as consultants, researchers, teachers, counsellors and international marketers. Support for

academics involved in international activities is scarce and the central and strategic control of resources with its demands for flexibility compromises the quality of academic life.

Taylorization of Education

Disaffection with our experience of academic life and the need to offer some form of challenge and resistance to managerialist policies and practices served as the catalyst for developing this analysis. To provide a framework to help us make sense of the cause of our dissatisfaction, we turned to a theory from our discipline of management that has underpinned much management ideology and practice since the turn of the twentieth century – Taylorism or scientific management. We chose to use the principles of scientific management in preference to the popular critique of modern society by Ritzer (1993) who gave the label of 'McDonaldization' to the application of the principles of fast-food outlets in the dispensing of health, education, and travel in modern society. Although McDonaldization with its emphasis on efficiencies, predicability and control does capture some of the features of mass production relevant to our experience it does not address what we feel to be the greatest attack on contemporary academic work within an international program. This we have identified as the wresting of intellectual labour from academic staff by corporate decision makers thereby casting academics in the role of process labourer. Because we are also loathe to perpetuate, even unconsciously, the implied suggestion that the primary task of higher education is business (see Prichard & Willmott 1997) we have also, despite their provocative and popular appeal, rejected the use of the labels McDonaldization and McUniversity (Parker & Jary 1995) in this chapter.

In referring to our industrial past, we are nonetheless continuing a considerable tradition of educators who have done similarly to make sense of current academic labour in higher education (eg. Parker & Jary 1995, Willmott 1995). For instance, the metaphors of the academic labour process as the academic assembly line (Barry et al. 2001) and the academic production line (Parker & Jary, 1995) and more recently the mill (Winter et al. 2000) are used to convey the sense of de-skilling and de-professionalization of academics in today's factories of learning. During the mid-1990s, this was exemplified by the debate waged by academics about the Fordist climate within distance education in general, and United Kingdom Open University (UKOU) in particular (see Stevens 1996 for an overview of the debate). It has been noted that Fordism is a term used quite loosely to describe the labour processes demanded by mass production as well as national and global regulation (Sayer 1996). It is the labour process described as Fordist (Amin cited in Holmer Nadesan 2001) that is of relevance here. Scientific management, an essential platform of Fordist ideology, refers specifically to that labour process, which for the purposes of this chapter, provides the boundary to our discussion.

The founder of scientific management, Frederick Winslow Taylor, an engineer, developed his particular theory of labour process in the late 1800s and early 1900s following his intense interest in workplace productivity and efficiency (Jaffee 2001). At a time when production was increasingly socialized into large-scale organizations, Taylor noted the increasing control skilled workers and not the owners had over the pace and organization of work (Hatch 1997). Taylor believed worker control and know-how placed owners at a disadvantage because production depended on workers' discretion to determine their own efficiencies (Jaffee 2001). In order to overcome this, Taylor, concerned by the lack of rational work systems within manufacturing, developed principles for establishing independent estimations of optimal inputs and outputs.

The systems Taylor implemented were designed to wrest control of production from workers in order to give control back to the employers. Having gained that control, Taylor then instituted the means to increase the pace of work and increase efficiencies (Thompson & McHugh 1990). To gain control over work processes, employers had to diminish workers' power vested in their knowledge of work processes based on experience and traditions of their various trades. Taylor identified this knowledge as the 'rule of thumb' and contrasted it with the application of rational scientific processes developed and controlled by managers. He argued "the management must take over and perform much of the work that is now left to the men" (Taylor 1911, cited in Jaffee 2001: 51). Taylor's other concern was the irregularity and unreliability of production, and again, it was only through the application of scientific methods to production that standards could be regularized and instituted. Idiosyncratic work patterns and methods were to be replaced by the "one best way" (Taylor 1912, cited in Locke 1982: 15) determined by the manager. Adopting principles of standardization, tools and procedures were also developed by management in accordance with designs that experiments had shown to be the most effective in a given context (Locke 1982: 15). In this way, managers assumed control over workers and production.

According to Morgan (1997), scientific management offered the promise of consistency, efficiency, standardization and predicability of products and services. Through the separation of the planning and design of work from those who perform the work, managers established controls over workers. Jobs were to be designed by the managers that could by their nature control, without the necessity of close supervision, the pace and execution of the work.

It is not, we believe, an exaggerated claim that the principles of scientific management are currently enacted in our university's approach to internationalizing the curriculum. Consistent with the principles of scientific management, the move to internationalization has emerged from centralized corporate decision makers who have done the thinking, designed the processes, developed the policies and informed the teaching staff of their tasks. That is, the serious business of knowledge creation is now the privilege of corporate decision makers far removed from teaching contexts, displacing academic staff, the previous custodians of teaching and learning in higher

education. Academic teaching staff in this context are no longer valued for their intellectual contribution to student learning but for their ability to deliver pre-packaged education with efficiency and economy.

This Taylorized approach to education can accommodate and indeed encourages over-enrolments of students. Fewer academics are required to address the learning requirements of a growing and diverse student population (Allport 2000, Coaldrake 1999). Recent figures released by the Australian Vice Chancellors' Committee (AVCC 2001) highlight this trend. The ratio between students and teaching staff has "worsened substantially, rising from 12.9 per cent of students for each university teacher in 1990 to 18.8 students for each teacher in 2000". The figures for Business, the faculty to which we belong, together with Law and Administration are even higher with a student staff ratio of 28.3 in 2000. This chapter is not arguing that internationalization strategies are the sole contributors to this worsening ratio, and the AVCC papers detail many other factors. Nonetheless, the AVCC does note that even those universities and disciplines successful at attracting full-fee paying students, who at undergraduate level tend to be overseas students, experience worsening ratios.

The growth in student teaching ratios has been made possible by the widespread availability of telecommunication technologies. So too, is the current strategy of internationalization dependent on these technologies. For the majority of students, interaction with the academic occurs electronically, either through web-based discussion groups or by email. There is an expectation that on-campus students attend tutorials and lectures but because their teaching staff are often sessional and not available outside their limited teaching hours, they too require these communication technologies. Although online education is expensive to establish and maintain (Allport 2000, Welch 2002), senior administrators and academics champion the availability of virtual and flexible learning wherever a student may be living and working. Significantly, the promise of flexibility provided by learning technologies have exacerbated stresses on staffing by allowing universities do more with less – increase enrolments, resist the hiring of new tenured teaching staff and substitute tenured staff with casualized teaching-only positions (Welch 2002). Allport (2000) notes however that students will not be satisfied with an education that is little more than the downloading of notes.

Case Study: Teaching an Internationalized Curriculum in a Managerialist Context

The strategy of internationalization taken by our university is a combination of twinning in Singapore and Hong Kong, the establishment of teaching campuses off-shore in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia and Johannesburg, South Africa and extensive efforts to attract overseas students, especially at post-graduate level, to study at one of the six Victorian-based campuses. Until the departure of the university's previous Vice Chancellor in 2002, plans were in place to open further campuses in South East

Asia and the Indian sub-continent (Monash University Office of International Development n.d.). Research sites additional to those based in London, UK and Trento, Italy were to be opened in Germany and in North America (Monash University 2002a).

Within the Monash Teaching and Learning Plan 2003-2005 (Monash University n.d.), considerable attention is paid to the requirements of an internationalized institution with a number of objectives detailed for the internationalization of the curriculum, greater sensitivity to cultural diversity and encouragement to staff and students to study and work in other countries. In recognition of the need for the internationalization of the curriculum a project called the Curriculum Internationlisation and Flexible Delivery Project was undertaken within the Faculty of Business and Economics (see Monash University 2003). This was a pilot project designed to develop internationalized course materials and flexible delivery options for two core first year undergraduate units taught within the Bachelor of Business and Commerce Degree, one of which was the core first year management unit in which we teach.

Within our department, those involved in the project problematized the internationalization aspects of the project because of staff concerns about Western-centric focus of the management discipline. However as the project progressed, it was clear that internationalization issues were subordinated to issues of flexible delivery of materials to large numbers of students. Eventually, in line with Taylorist principles of efficiency through standardization, the objectives of the project were modified to include the design of standardized subject content for delivery to students enrolled in the Faculty's global degree. As part of the push for standardization, the 'one hundred per cent rule' was introduced. Like Taylor's mantra of the 'one best way', the rule stipulated that students enrolled within the Bachelor of Business and Commerce degree, irrespective of the campus on which they are located or mode through which they participated in study, received the same curriculum, completed the same assessment tasks, sat the same examinations and were assessed by the same criteria (Monash University 2002b).

Contrary to expectations, the one hundred per cent rule does permit some flexibility. Different texts may be chosen to suit local circumstances and there is some provision of local references and readings to suit local needs. In the main though, academic staff generally adhere to the rule for reasons of convenience and consistency and most students use the same text and references regardless of their location. Because of the cultural origin of much of the course content within management courses the rule creates problems for staff and students. Far from being culturally neutral (DeBry 2001) the content and ideology of the Management texts are predominantly developed in the United States with a few modified by the addition of local case studies provided by Anglo-European authors based in Australia (see for example, Bartol, Martin, Tein & Matthews 2003; Robbins, Bergman, Stagg & Coulter 2003, Waddell, Cummings & Worley 2000).

We are acutely aware of the irony that we not only experience cultural domination by United States of America in our discipline (see also Clegg, Linstead & Sewell 2000) but we perpetuate this domination in the broader international context.

Course content experienced by all students could be typified as overwhelmingly Western in orientation, and almost exclusively US in content. References to other cultures are in the main, incidental, anecdotal and from the position that suggests North American culture is the norm. Examples and language relevant to the United States such as "minorities", Hispanics, people of colour and so on highlight the extent to which the materials are culturally grounded in North American language and culture (see, for example, Managerial Communication texts such as Daniels, Spiker & Papa, 1997, Gamble & Gamble, 1999). This homogenization of course content along with the Taylorist pressures of standardization militate against any benefits derived from teaching in an internationalized context.

To administer the common curriculum, and in an effort to maintain standardization, the Department of Management has adopted a model in which each subject is allocated a Coordinator/Chief Examiner who is responsible for curriculum development, curriculum maintenance, establishment of assessment tasks, setting of examinations, and the moderation of assessments, and who is the final point of accountability for the distribution of results across the campuses and to all students. The Chief Examiner's brief is to consult with academic staff over teaching and pedagogical issues. However, for the academic staff teaching within this degree, academic independence and autonomy is very limited by this level of centralized decision making. In practice, Chief Examiners (who get a time allowance for their role) become managers. They make most of the decisions to ensure the standardized delivery of course content with varying levels of consultation with other academic staff. Tightly controlled by common learning objectives, assessments and examinations that ensure that the curriculum conforms to the one hundred per cent rule, the only autonomy accorded to academics is in the development of lecture and tutorial materials for one's campus.

As our case study demonstrates, the Taylorized approach to international education has many attractions for an 'enterprise university'. It offers guarantees of standardized curriculum and standardized assessments, and the reassurance to students and employers of the consistency of the degree irrespective of where that degree is completed. More importantly, efficiencies can be expected with the standardization of courses. Only one set of materials is required, the longer life of materials allows larger print-runs of print materials and other materials can be made available electronically. This point in particular was made in a university document in which the author noted "Standardisation of content facilitates the use of flexible learning support materials in a wider range of teaching situations and therefore *reduces the average cost of using them*" (emphasis added) (Monash University 2003: 3). Further efficiencies can be expected from this Taylorized approach as teaching duties such as marking and student support can now be outsourced. There is an assumption that freed from the necessity to develop curricula that addresses the particular circumstances of their students, academics can churn through increased student numbers. As we indicated earlier, this Taylorized approach accommodates and indeed encourages over-enrolments of students.

Some Thoughts for a Way Forward

Although we are very critical of the quality of education provided to students in the name of internationalized curriculum our concern in this chapter is to comment on the Taylorist assault on the professionalism of academic staff (Danaher, Gale & Erben 2000), teaching autonomy and intellectual freedom. Allport (2000: 43) describes intellectual freedom as "the rights of academic staff to freely discuss, teach, assess, develop curricula, publish research and engage in community service." The university's approach to internationalization has, in its execution, seriously eroded a substantial component of the recognized basic rights of academic staff. In our experience of internationalization, academics are no longer in control of curriculum development, teaching or assessment, and are facing what Marginson (2000a) refers to as the deconstruction of the academic profession. Standardized courses rob academics of professional autonomy, professional judgement and intellectual engagement. This loss of engagement has been exacerbated by the increasing casualization of academic staff to service the internationalized curriculum, which not only offers a serious challenge to service quality but also undermines academics' capacity to engage in open and robust debate.

From our perspective, internationalization, like the globalizing forces from which it emanates, creates a complex and ambiguous context for teaching and learning. On the one hand, internationalization exerts a centralizing and homogenizing influence on academic work illustrated by the strengthening of the cultural hegemony of Anglo-American thinking in both the content and teaching approaches of our courses. At the same time, our academic labour is increasingly shaped by Taylorist methods developed to overcome the problems of providing educational services to students separated by time and geography. Taylorization has stripped us of our autonomy as teachers and researchers because the relationship between the thinkers (academics as researchers) and the doers (academics as teachers) has been displaced.

In contrast to this experience of internationalization, there are approaches that offer greater potential for positive changes to teaching and learning by creating the possibility of multiple viewpoints, new ideas and the intellectual space to challenge the values and assumptions that underpin our discipline. There are a number of writers in the area that offer a pedagogical (as opposed to a managerialist) rationale for an internationalized curriculum that enhances academic autonomy and promotes student participation in their own learning program (see for example Schoorman 2000, Whalley 1997).

Indeed, our own university, in its literature on internationalizing the curriculum, refers to guidelines from a document titled *Best Practice Guidelines for Internationalizing the Curriculum* (Whalley 1997). With the stated objective of creating intercultural/international literacy, the guidelines seek to 'concretize' the internationalization project. Drawing on the work of two European scholars (Bremer & van der Wende 1995, cited in Whalley 1997: 2) an internationalized curriculum is described as:

> Curricula with an international orientation in content, aimed at preparing students for performing (professionally/ socially) in an international and multi-cultural context, and designed for domestic students and/or foreign students.

The Whalley (1997) document provides extensive detail in areas of curriculum development at the program and unit level, identifying necessary support activities to the process of internationalization of the curriculum. Although the guiding principles are recommended reading by the professional Teaching and Learning specialists in the university, they cannot yet be integrated into teaching practice by academic staff while the standardization approach to internationalization imposed at the operational level by the university managers remains in place.

Similarly, Schoorman (2000), while arguing for a more overtly political conceptualization of internationalization than Whalley, clearly establishes ground rules for curriculum development and provides a creative direction for academic teaching practice. The key components of Schoorman's vision of internationalization include the requirement to be a) counter-hegemonic, b) on-going, c) comprehensive, d) multifaceted and e) integrated (Schoorman 2000: 6). It is clear that unlike those who manage internationalization in our university, Schoorman's (2000) model of inter-nationalization is one that focuses on pedagogical issues of teaching and learning and not just administrative solutions and outcomes. For Schoorman (2000), internationali-zation demands curriculum change to accommodate multiple perspectives implicit within a global model. She embraces diversity brought about by internationalization and recognizes the multifaceted ways (compared to the Taylorist ideal of 'the one best way') in which internationalization can be addressed in university lecture theatres and classrooms. Of particular value in Schoorman's (2000) model is the critical perspective on internationalization that recommends a counter-hegemonic orientation to education and the importance of returning the responsibility of internationalizing curricula to teachers and learners.

For us, this model, if even partially implemented, signals an end to the Taylorist approach to education we describe above. It points to the value of a multifaceted program of action, compared with the homogenized delivery of commodified teaching materials, designed by curriculum developers far removed from teaching and learning contexts. Interestingly, some of the ideas outlined in Schoorman resonate with the recent statements by policy makers in the Australian higher education bureaucracy. To quote a recent Australian Minister for Education, Brendan Nelson (2002: x):

> Student-centred learning environments should serve the needs of an increasingly diverse group of students without compromising the effectiveness of learning or adversely affecting the working environment for academics and other staff. This will require consideration of the timing and structure of learning experiences and the feasibility of customised or individualised approaches to higher education curricula.

Should this policy on internationalization be implemented, there would be the requirement that time and money be allocated to local academics and students to develop course materials that provide global perspectives and incorporate intercultural approaches to understanding key concepts within different subject areas. There may even be resources allocated to programs such as teaching exchanges so that academics can gain international experience working beside overseas colleagues and students in class rooms in Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore and China.

Despite our enthusiasm for Nelson's rhetoric, Whalley's practical good sense and Schoorman's vision of internationalization, we are sufficiently pragmatic to be aware that others within our university may be less excited by the proposal. We are currently in an era in higher education where all staff are exhorted to do more with less. More teaching hours, more students, more courses, more subjects, more majors and of course more research, more publications, more grants and not forgetting more administration, more committees, and more accountability. Clearly, the models of internationalization presented by Whalley and Schoorman and the one mooted by the current education bureaucracy require considerable resources to flow to the contexts in which teaching and learning occur. Again, pragmatism tells us this is unlikely.

It is generally accepted wisdom that universities are "in crisis" and their contributions to the societies within which they are located are increasingly under challenge (see Blackmore 2001 for a review of many recent books on the issue). The Federal Government that once provided 85 per cent of funding for higher education in Australia now provides only 48 per cent (Marginson 2002). Recent geopolitical events following acts of terrorism on symbols of Western capitalism in the United States and Indonesia are being held responsible for falling enrolments of international students to our university. With fewer students, falling income and growing debt we anticipate greater pressure on academic staff to produce more materials for distribution as efficiently and cheaply as possible. With more emphasis on reducing costs and less on pedagogical excellence we know internationalization as we have experienced it will continue.

Conclusion

While managerialism is alive and well in our university, managerialist practices are not uncontested by those within it. University staff have responded to changes in their work environments in a variety of ways including collusion, resentment and resistance (see, for example, Chandler et al. 2002, Gleeson & Shain 1999, Parker & Jary 1995). This chapter has been our response. It offers not only a challenge to our university's managerialist response to internationalization, but also a way forward. Scholars such as Whalley (1997) and Schoorman (2000) remind us of the 'business' of diverse educational institutions such as ours – teaching and learning – and the importance of pedagogical issues and individual needs rather than efficiency and standardization.

Despite the pressures of contemporary academic work, we must continue to engage in argument and be willing to contest the managerialist practices that threaten to separate the thinking from the doing of teaching practise, particularly in the current internationalized environment in which we teach. As our chapter demonstrates, there are alternative approaches to the managerialist 'one best way', for developing a more inclusive, democratic and multi-faceted approach to teaching in an internationalized context. Internationalization has the potential to open up learning opportunities for staff and students, particularly within our management discipline with its Western-centric assumptions and US-based interpretations of cultural diversity. Without such approaches, the discipline of management is in danger of becoming irrelevant to our students as they seek employment in increasingly globalized and internationalized workplaces.

We are critical of the quality of education provided to our students and the practices that rob us, and our colleagues, of our professional autonomy and devalue our intellectual endeavours. To make sense of this we turned to our management discipline and the ideas of Frederick Taylor to argue that current practices constitute the Taylorization of higher education, exemplified by centralized corporate planning and the push to provide educational courses in the most efficient and effective way through common curricula and standardized course materials. The pressures of internationalization and managerialist responses to falling government funding have compromized our academic autonomy, threatened our profession and increased our teaching workloads. Nonetheless, despite our understanding of the current financial pressures on the university we call for an approach to internationalization that recognizes the important link between academics' research activities and the contribution these activities make to the pedagogical soundness of the courses we offer students in an internationalized context.

References

Allport, C. 2000. "Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: Lifelong Learning and the Implications for University Staff." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 22(1): 37-47.

Australian Vice-Chancellor's Committee (AVCC). 2001. *Fact Sheet 4: The Worsening Student Teacher Ratio.* [online] Retrieved 22 Aug 2002. Available from http://www.avcc.edu.au/policies_activities/international_relations/internationalisation_initiatives/offshor.htm.

Barry, J., Chandler, J. & Clark, H. 2001. "Between the Ivory Tower and the Academic Assembly Line." *Journal of Management Studies* 38(1): 87-99.

Bartol, K., Martin, D., Tein, M. & Matthews, G. 2003. *Management: A Pacific Rim Focus (International Edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Beamer, L. 1992. "Learning Intercultural Communication Competence." *The Journal of Business Communication* 29(3): 295-293.

Bellamy, S., Morley, C. & Watty, K. 2003. "Why Business Academics Remain in Australian Universities Despite Deteriorating Working Conditions and Reduced Job Satisfaction:

An Intellectual Puzzle." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 25(1): 13-28.

Blackmore, J. 2001. "Universities in Crisis? Knowledge Economies, Emancipatory Pedagogies, and the Critical Intellectual." *Educational Theory* 51(3): 353-369.

Chandler, J., Barry, J. & Clark, H. 2002. "Stressing Academe: The Wear and Tear of the New Public Management." *Human Relations* 55(9):1051-1069.

Clegg, S., Linstead, S. & Sewell, G. 2000. "Only Penguins: A Polemic on Organization Theory from the Edge of the World". *Organization Studies* 21: 103-117

Coaldrake, P. 1999. "Rethinking University Work" Paper presented at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia Annual International Conference, Melbourne, 12-15 July.

Coaldrake, P. & Stedman, L. 1999. "Academic Work in the Twenty-first Century: Changing Roles and Policies." Occasional Paper Series no. 99H. Canberra: Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Danaher, P., Gale, T. & Erben, T. 2000 "The Teacher Educator as (Re) Negotiated Professional: Critical Incidents in Steering between State and Market in Australia." *Journal of Education for Teaching* 26(1): 55-71.

Daniels, T., Spiker, B. & Papa, M. 1997. *Perspectives on Organisational Communication (4th Edition)*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Deem, R. 2001. "Globalisation, New Managerialism, Academic Capitalism and Entrepreneurialism in Universities: Is the Local Dimension Important?" *Comparative Education* 37(1): 7-20.

DeBry, D. 2001. "Globalizing Instructional Materials: Guidelines for Higher Education." *TechTrends* 45(6): 41-45.

Gamble, T. & Gamble, M. 1999. *Communication Works (6th Edition)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Gleeson, D. & Shain, F. 1999. "Managing Ambiguity: Between Markets and Managerialism - A Case Study of 'Middle Managers' in Further Education." *The Sociological Review* 47(3): 461-490.

Gudykunst, W. & Kim, Y. 1997. *Communicating with Strangers: An Approach to Intercultural Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hatch, M. 1997. *Organization Theory Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Holmer Nadesan, M. 2001 "Post Fordism, Political Economy, and Critical Organizational Communication Studies." *Management Communication Quarterly* 15(2): 259-264.

Jaffee, D. 2001. *Organization Theory Tension and Change*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Knight, J. & de Wit, H. 1995. "Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives" in *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America* edited by H. de Wit. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.

Lewis R. 1998. "Commodified Curricula: The Coursebook." *Australian Universities Review* 41(2): 3-4.

Locke, E. 1982. "The Ideas of Frederick W. Taylor: An Evaluation." *The Academy of Management Review* 7(1): 14-24.

Marginson, S. 1997. *Markets in Education*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Marginson, S. 2000a. "Rethinking Academic Work in the Global Era." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 22(1): 23-35.

Marginson, S. 2000b. *Monash*: *Remaking the University*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Marginson, S. & Considine, M. 2000. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. Oakleigh, Victoria: Cambridge University Press.

Marginson, S. 2002. "The Phenomenal Rise of International Degrees Down Under." *Change* 34(3): 34-43.

Monash University. 2002a. "Global Development" [online]. Melbourne: Monash University Website. Retrieved October 30 2002. Available from http://www.monash.edu.au/intoff/global development/index2.html.

Monash University. 2002b. *Undergraduate 2002.* Clayton: Monash University.

Monash University. Office of International Development. n.d. "Monash in 2006" [online]. Melbourne: Monash University Website, retrieved August 19 2003. Available from http://www.monash.edu.au/international/oid/pandp/d…/monash2006.html.

Monash University. n.d. "Teaching and Learning Plan 2003-2005" [online]. Melbourne: Monash University Website. Retrieved August 19 2003. Available from http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/dvcap/ltp/LTPoverview.html.

Monash University. 2003. "Strategic Innovations Fund, Final Report" [online]. Melbourne: Monash University Website. Retrieved August 18 2003. Available from http://www.adm.monash.edu.au/dvcap/grants/00_13fin.htm.

Morgan, G. 1997. *Images of Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Nelson, B. 2002. *Striving for Quality: Learning, Teaching and Scholarship*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Parker, M. & Jary, D. 1995. "The McUniversity: Organization, Management and Academic Subjectivity." *Organization* 2(2): 319-338.

Peoples Wessinger, N. 1994. "Celebrating Our Differences: Fostering Ethnicity in Homogenous Settings." *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance* 65(9): 62-69.

Porter, P. & Vidovich, L. 2000. "Globalization and Higher Education Policy." *Educational Theory* 50(4): 449-453.

Pratt, G. & Poole, D. 1999/2000. "Global Corporations 'R' Us? The Impacts of Globalisation on Australian Universities." *Australian Universities Review* 42(2)/43(1): 16-23.

Prichard, C. & Willmott, H.1997. "Just How Managed is the McUniversity?" *Organization Studies* 18(2): 287-317.

Ritzer, G. 1993. *The McDonaldization of Society*. Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Rizvi, F. & Walsh, L. 1998. "Difference, Globalisation and the Internationalisation of the Curriculum." *Australian Universities Review* 41(2): 7-11.

Robbins S., Bergman, R., Stagg, I. & Coulter, M. 2003. *Management* (3rd Edition). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Prentice Hall Australia Ltd.

Sayer, A. 1996. "Book Review – Post-Fordism: A Reader, Edited by Ash Amin." *Capital and Class* 59 (Summer): 151-153.

Schoorman, D. 2000. "What Really Do We Mean by 'Internationalization'?" *Contemporary Education* 71(4): 5-11.

Scott, P. (ed.) 1998. *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University.

Stevens, K. 1996. "Have the Shifting Sands of Fordism Resulted in Ground Lost or Ground Gained for Distance Education?" *Distance Education* 17(2): 247-258.

Taylor, T., Gough, J., Bundrock, V. & Winter, R. 1998. "A Bleak Outlook: Academic Staff Perceptions of Changes in Core Activities in Australian Higher Education, 1991-1996." *Studies in Higher Education* 23(3): 255-268.

Thompson, P. & McHugh, D. 1990. *Work Organisations: A Critical Introduction.* London: Macmillan.

Waddell, D., Cummings, T. & Worley, C. 2000. *Organization Development and Change (Pacific Rim Edition)*. Melbourne: Nelson Thompson Learning.

Welch, A. 1998. "The End of Certainty? The Academic Profession and the Challenge of Change." *Comparative Education Review* 42(1): 1-10.

Welch, A. 2002. "Going Global? Internationalizing Australian Universities in a Time of Global Crisis." *Comparative Education Review* 46(4): 433-471.

Welch, A. & Denman, B. 1997. "Internationalisation of Higher Education: Retrospect and Prospect." *Forum of Education* 52(1): 14-29.

Whalley, T. 1997. *Best Practice Guidelines for Internationalizing the Curriculum.* Victoria, BC: Ministry of Education, Skills and Training, and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer and Technology. Retrieved December 15 2003. http://www.ctt.bc.ca/curric/BP.

Willmott, H. 1995. "Managing the Academics; Commodification and Control in the Development of University Education in the UK." *Human Relations* 48(9): 993-1028.

Winter, R., Taylor, T. & Sarros, J. 2000. "Trouble at Mill: Quality of Academic Worklife Issues within a Comprehensive Australian University." *Studies in Higher Education* 25(3): 279-294.