Reforming New Zealand's universities: reflections on the production of academic subjects

Cris Shore, University of Auckland

Draft, EASA Conference August 2008

Abstract

The restructuring of education in New Zealand is often proclaimed as a paradigm case of neo-liberal governance and New Public Management. In New Zealand, as in Europe, universities have become central to government's vision of the future, one increasingly shaped to meet the demands of the global knowledge economy. However, that vision contains contradictory agendas. While government calls on universities to drive its 'economic transformation agenda' and promote greater internationalization and commercialization of university research, it also expects universities to play a key role in nation-building, social cohesion and 'national identity' – as well as upholding the mantle of 'critic and conscience of society'.

Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork, this paper explores the consequences of these often contradictory agendas. It asks: how are universities reconciling the multiple purposes they have been ascribed? How do staff and students experience these reforms, and how are they impacting on academic culture and practice? What new kinds of political subjects and subjectivities are being created as a result of these changes?

Architects of the EU's 'Bologna Process' have noted that university reforms can only take effect if they are 'owned' by academics and incorporated into their everyday thinking and practice. Focusing on recent examples of conflict and tension within New Zealand's universities, the paper explores the extent to which academics and students have embraced and internalized management's vision for its universities, and the technologies and pressures that have been brought to bear to make them do so.

The ascendancy of neoliberalism and the associated discourses of 'new public management' during the 1980s and 1990s has produced a fundamental shift in the way universities and other institutions of higher educations have defined and justified their institutional existence. The traditional professional culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate has been replaced with an institutional stress on performativity … .strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits.

(Olssen and Peters 2005:1)

Introduction: University Reform, New Zealand and the Global Knowledge Economy

Since the 1980s, universities throughout the developed world have been subjected to an almost continuous process of re-structuring and reform as governments have tried to curb public spending and capitalize on the new economic opportunities being opened up university teaching and research in the new 'global knowledge economy'. New Zealand is often held up as a pioneer in the introduction of neo-liberalism, New Public Management and the commercialization of academic research.[1] That reform process has been marked by:

1. A major expansion of student numbers (the massification of universities) coupled with a steep decline in the level of government funding per student. These developments mark a paradigm shift from the idea of tertiary education as a 'public good' geared to producing an educated citizenry to a new conception of higher education as an individual economic investment (see Ingenio interview)
2. A corresponding shift in the idea of the university, from the Humboldtian notion of the university as a place of critical enquiry and autonomous learning to that of the university as a transnational business corporation operating in a competitive global knowledge economy'.(Readings 1996:13)

In pursuit of this neoliberal vision, successive governments in NZ and elsewhere have introduced new methods of funding and new systems of auditing and accountability designed to make universities more economical, accountable, flexible and more responsive both to industry and to government itself. These changes have been accompanied by the rise of new regimes for the measurement and monitoring, 'quality assurance', 'performance management' and 'international benchmarking' that is quite unprecedented in history. From the perspective of many academics, today's managed university seems to have more systems in place for the discipline and surveillance of academic activity than Foucault's archetypal nineteenth century prison.

One of the consequences of all these changes is a growing sense of uncertainty about the role of the university in society. Despite the proliferation of 'vision statements' and 'strategic plans', it is no longer clear what the university is actually *for*. Moreover, the modern university was historically linked to the nation sate, which it served by promoting the idea of a common national culture. But as Bill Readings noted over 20 years ago, the nation-state is no longer the major site at which capital reproduces itself and 'national culture no longer provides an overarching ideological meaning for what goes on in the University'. This has led some scholars to conclude that commercialization is leading to the death of the project of liberal education. Not only is the professoriate 'being proletarianized' with rising numbers of academic staff on casualized, short-term contracts (over 70% of academics in the USA), but the production of knowledge within Universities is now 'equally uncertain' (Readings 1996: 1).

What effect are these reforms having on the way we think about universities and their role in society? How are they changing the behaviour and self-understandings of university staff and students? And what are their implications for the future of our universities? These are some of the wider questions that I am currently researching in my project on 'University reform and the Knowledge Economy'. My aim, like that of any institutional ethnography, is to understand how these events appear to the actors themselves; to analyse how staff, students and managers perceive, experience and negotiate the institutional changes brought by those reforms, what they say about them, and the issues and concerns that most affect their lives and everyday relationships (Smith 2002).

In this paper I will focus on 4 key questions that have provided a focus for my research:

1. What is the state of New Zealand's universities two decades after the neoliberal revolution of the 1980s?
2. What is government's 'vision' for the sector and how are universities reconciling the multiple roles they have been ascribed?
3. How do staff and students experience these reforms, and how are they impacting on academic culture and practice?
4. What new kinds of political subjects and subjectivities are being created as a result of these changes? And what do these patterns tell us about wider trends in the progress of neoliberalization?

Since anthropology's approach necessarily rests on comparisons, let me begin with a more global comparative perspective.

University Reform in International Context: How Government sees universities

Like other OECD countries, the NZ government looks to universities to drive the knowledge economy on whose success it depends for sustaining New Zealand's position among the world's wealthiest states. Since the 1990s, governments everywhere seem to have re-discovered the commercial value of universities and have made them central to their vision of the future (Peters 2001). In Britain, that vision was clearly set out in the Government's 2003 White Paper, *The Future of Higher Education*:

> We see a higher education sector which meets the needs of the economy in terms of trained people, research and technology transfer. At the same time it needs to enable all suitably qualified individuals to develop their potential both intellectually and personally, and to provide the necessary storehouse of expertise in science and technology, and the arts and humanities which defines our civilisation and culture.

As Steffan Collini commented at the time: 'It is hardly surprising that universities in Britain are badly demoralized' as 'no single institution could successfully achieve all the aims crammed into this unlovely paragraph'. But this is quite a modest vision compared to that of the New Zealand government. The recent Tertiary Educations Strategy (TES) lists 13 priority 'targets' that it now requires universities to meet.[2] These include everything from;

> creating a highly skilled workforce, economic transformation, 'developing leaders with entrepreneurial and business management skills to underpin innovation', to social development, Maori development, promoting 'a high-value export education sector', 'pride in who and what we are', and safeguarding our shared and diverse cultures. And lastly, 'continuing to act as 'the critic and conscience of society' (TES 2007: 8-9).

In short, government now expects universities to fulfill an extraordinary wide range of sometimes contradictory roles and functions.

Many scholars argue that the commercialization of higher education has fostered a new type of tertiary education entity: the rise of the supermarketed 'McUniversity' (Neave 2005) in which core academic values are suborned by the rapid rise of money-making initiatives and 'opportunities to turn specialized knowledge into profit' (Bok 2003)..[3] Governments and university managers typically emphasize the 'Knowledge Society and Economy' paradigm, but in practice it is the 'knowledge economy' discourse that dominates. This is a view shared by many staff too: as one

informant put it, far from neoliberalism being over, this was simply 'a phase of consolidation, when the neoliberal reforms become entrenched and normalized' (Kelsey).

In my view that argument is too simple. While it is certainly the case that government increasingly seeks to exploit the commercial value of universities in the emerging global 'knowledge economy', in New Zealand a new set of discourses has emerged around universities and their role in society, one that tries to bring together a plethora of different (and often contradictory) visions that go beyond neoliberalism and commercialisation. What we are witnessing is not the death of the traditional liberal idea of the university so much as a shift to a new multi-layered conception in which universities are now expected to serve a plethora of different functions, social and symbolic as well as economic and political.[4] Milojevic identifies no less that six different models or visions of the contemporary university: (Milojevic 1998): These include the University as;

1. **a corporation**; an independent and autonomous business, or place for vocational training..[5]
2. **place of/for academic leadership**, acquisition of knowledge, search for truth. [6]
3. **cultural coordinator for the nation**; the body that educates people for citizenship [7]
4. **Poliversities and multiversities** instead of universities and even diversities.
5. emerging **global electronic university**;
6. a **community-based institution**, whose main function is public service and outreach.

The competition between these bundled models is one of the reasons why university life has become so stressful for university staff, particularly academics. Academics are now subject to more forms of accountability than almost any other public service professional - and considerably more so than politicians, government officials or journalists.[8]

How are these neoliberal reforms affecting university staff and students?

From my interviews and observations 3 issues emerge;

1. Government intervention in tertiary education
2. Commercialisation
3. The PBRF research assessment exercise

1. Government intervention in University research

Many features of the current tertiary education funding regime originated from the neoliberal experiment of the 1980s when New Zealand experienced 'the most radical application of neo-

conservative policies in the English speaking world' (Bruneau and Savage 2002:121). [9] As in the UK, 'rhetoric about freedom, decentralization, and the end of government control combined in practice with greatly increased centralization and bureaucracy' as government pursued its goal of a more privatized system (Bruneau, Savage, and Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2002).

Whether or not that neoconservative experiment has ended is a topic of much debate in New Zealand, but most interviewees expressed the view that we had entered a 'phase of consolidation' rather than one of retreat, and that the past 3 Labour governments had made little attempt to reverse the neoliberalization process or relinquish control over the sector.[10] If anything, the level of state intervention has increased, particularly through the way funding is targeted. The 2007 Tertiary Education Strategy states that future investment will be geared: 'to maximize tertiary education's contribution to our national goals [...] and what the government expects the tertiary education system to contribute (TES 2007: 4).[11]

In the 'new funding environment' universities are required to demonstrate that their education and research are contributing to positive economic, social, cultural and environmental outcomes for New Zealand. University funding (which is now termed 'strategic investment') is to be explicitly linked to specific TEC goals and to narrow measures of 'relevance' that leave little room for funding of basic, non-applied scientific research. This is unfortunate because, as some informants pointed out, such basic research often leads to serendipitous scientific discoveries with unforeseen applications. [12]

The investment approach has constructed a whole new regime of accountability around the instrumental notion of research as an 'investment' that can be measured in terms of its financial returns and political utility.

What this means in practice is:

1. Firstly, increasing direction of research funding into areas that conform to Government policy agendas and a focus on research that Government considers will have the greatest positive impact on national social and economic performance (in the words of one informant, areas 'like grass-growing and dairy production, or reducing methane emissions in cows').
2. Secondly, in the words of the DVC Research at Victoria University, increased pressure on universities 'to play an explicit role in the promotion of economic growth and to demonstrate the commercial applications of research.' (Quigley, 2007: 4)

This new 'investment approach' replaces the old funding model based on the number of or equivalent full-time students (or 'EFTS'). That previous model had been spectacularly successful in increasing the number of students in tertiary education but it also resulted in a proliferation of private tertiary providers and courses of dubious academic or vocational merit (of the infamous 'Twilight Golf' kind). The model also made no financial distinction between teaching-only and research-active institutions, or public and private providers; i.e. it gave no recognition to the research function of the university.

While the new funding framework goes some way to correcting the anomalies of the previous bulk funding 'bums on seats' model, it provides very limited new funding for universities. And although universities overall have benefited financially over other tertiary providers, the benefits are very uneven across the university sector, and the emphasis on research excellence has fuelled accusations of 'elitism' and fears about a 2-tiered university ranking system.

2. Commercialization of research - and Academia

This emphasis on applied research is consistent both with the government's view of universities as sites for training an educated workforce and the more recent idea of harnessing universities for its Economic Transformation Agenda - what critics have termed 'academic capitalism'. The University of Auckland has performed particularly well in this new environment. It has made a virtue of its entrepreneurialism in turning intellectual property into marketable commodities – so much so that staff have nicknamed the Research Office the 'Revenue Office'. The University's Profile proudly proclaims:

> The University of Auckland encourages the commercialisation of its research, thus making a significant contribution to New Zealand's economy. The market capitalisation of companies spun out of the University is around $NZ650 million while a New Zealand Institute economic report has shown that for every dollar generated by University research seven dollars of value is created in the regional economy.[13]

Our web-pages and promotional literature boast how much money the university generates and how many patents it has created. The New Zealand Committee of Vice Chancellors now makes its case for increased government funding not on the international excellence of its scholarship and teaching but on the commercial potential of its research and the better 'value for money' it provides compared to the Crown Research Institutes.

Most interviewees concurred that University research had become much more commercially oriented. The wholesale import of metaphors and concepts from business and accountancy has dramatically changed the way we think and talk about the University. 'Strategic plans', 'target setting', 'benchmarking', 'academic audits', 'quality assurance', 'annual performance review', 'performance indicators' – these terms, which were quite alien to the university environment 15 years ago, have now become the dominant discourse. As one academic from Victoria University puts it:

> Today research is not seen as primarily academic, or necessarily connected to scholarship and teaching. Instead research is seen primarily as a source of income to the University either through the creaming-off of external research grants or more recently through the government-funded PBRF system.

What effect is this politically-tuned commercialization having on staff research? Deans and HoDs are now much more aware of individual research performance and are increasingly obligated to pursue the University's financial targets and strategic goals of increasing graduate research students and doubling external research income to $270 million. Yet no one could explain the logic behind these targets, or why we had arrived at the magic figure of $270 million. 'It's aspirational' was how one university manager put it. By contrast, most staff described it as yet another example of the way 'research policy is being driven by accountants' rather than researchers.

Increasingly staff are having to look overseas to fund 'basic research' the funding provision in New Zealand is so poor. Many staff said they had given up trying for a Marsden grant, the only source of 'blue skies' research funding, describing it as 'a lottery': it has just a 7% success rate for Social Science applications, for example. Others said the compliance and overhead costs were so high they were often better off not bothering. As one science researcher remarked:

> *Would I be just as good playing on my own at the bench with hardly any money although getting more publications out of it? Possibly. I'd have more time to travel; I'd have a lot less worries, more time to really think.*

Another spoke about how she heard a colleague say:

> *I got a Marsden FastStart and it was just a terrible waste of time because I had to do all this administration and it stopped me doing my research.*

Motivating staff to apply for Marsden funding is now a major challenge in some faculties. Whether the net effect of all this has been to drive staff towards more commercializable fields of research is debatable: anecdotal evidence suggests the shift has simply been tactical; i.e. at least in the social sciences, researchers have learned how to play the game and now re-package their proposals using the language and protocols of applied science.

Where we do see more evidence of commercialization is the student population. In May 2008 University managers sent out an email alerting all staff to the dangers of a new website, apparently hosted by the UoA, offering to buy and sell past exam scripts. What we later discovered was that the creator of this venture was a second-year university student in the Business School who in 2007 had won the prestigious university Spark Entrepreneurship Award for his website 'unifriend.co.nz'. Students are also being encouraged, it seems, to commercialize their intellectual property.

3. The 'PBRF' Research Assessment and its implications

Perhaps the most significant change to the university research environment has been the introduction of the Performance Based Research Fund. The PBRF is the peer-review system designed to assess the performance of researchers and assign a score based on the quality of an individual's publications, contribution to the research environment, peer-esteem, external research income obtained and number of PhD students produced. On balance, most staff appeared to support the PBRF - not only because it's net effect has been to 'shift funding to the Universities from Institutes of Technology/Polytechnics' (Education Counts 2008) but primarily because, for the first time, it recognizes research as a major element of what universities do, and how they differ from other TEOs. Although the PBRF has contributed to a more competitive environment, staff welcomed the fact that it provides a measure of excellence *not* based simply on the amount income generated. Others said it had actually encouraged more collaboration and international cooperation. It had also given Faculties and Departments a new and independent source of income.

On the negative side, staff noted that the PBRF had fuelled institutional rivalry and internal divisions. 'It has created a two-class system', one HoD explained; 'you have the very research successful who have large pots of money, millions of dollars, big research groups, lots of PhD students … And then you have people who don't have the research funding, who don't have the graduate students'. Another said it encouraged an attitude of selfishness': People were 'less prepared to do the admin jobs' and use PBRF as excuse'. The PBRF has also changed the way people

disseminate research findings, encouraging a more short-term approach; a focus on articles rather than books and a proliferation of outputs (what some call the 'salami effect': i.e., slicing up findings to produce several small papers rather than just one, well-honed publication). Staff in the social sciences reported that by according higher status to articles published in international journals, the PBRF implicitly de-values local journals and New Zealand-based research.

Preparing for a PBRF exercise is an extremely time-consuming process that has also fuelled inter-university rivalry and gaming, including the poaching of star researchers from other institutions and attempts to hide less research-active staff so that they would not be counted in the overall tally. The most interesting finding was the apparent dislocation between the PBRF and the government's applied research which seem to be pulling researchers in different directions. As one Head of Department summed it up;

> In business and economics there's a mismatch in research between what people think we do and what we actually do. The problem is that the top journals in our field basically don't publish work that is very practical or applied. They want stuff that's got some theory behind it. The research that's published in our top journals has little relevance today. It might have relevance in 10, 15 years time, but not to the practical business problems of today'.

I.e. in some disciplines the leading journals don't want to publish work that is 'applied' and, by implication, short on theory, although government funding is targeted to applied research..

Another key effect of the current funding regime and its emphasis on differentiation and commercialization is the pressure it places on universities to brand themselves. But this emphasis on promoting 'the university brand' spurs a parallel concern to protect that brand from adverse publicity which often leads to bureaucratic closure. The 'draft Policy on Institutional Research' tabled at Research Committee in 2006 exemplifies this. The policy sought to make it compulsory for any UoA academic wishing to conduct research on the University or its policies to gain prior approval from their 'line manager'. The proposal was eventually squashed, but it is a cause of concern that such a policy of censorship could have been seriously mooted.

Conclusions

The key question raised at the outset was what new kinds of political subjects and subjectivities are being created as a result of these changes? And what do these patterns tell us about wider trends in the progress of neoliberalization? Let me conclude by extrapolating some general observations about the new regime that is being forged as a result of the reforms:

1. Changes in the self-understanding of the university

In response to the government's economic agenda, the UoA's management team increasingly defines the university in term of its commercial interests and entrepreneurial output. Despite the other competing visions, the 'knowledge economy' is the dominant discourse today . As Grant Duncan observes, '[g]one is the old ideal of the "impartial, disinterested pursuit of truth"; the new guiding institutional principles is the 'political-economic value-added' vision (Duncan 2004: 4). The university's main role now appears to be to 'help maximize wealth and minimize social and environmental risks' (2004: 4).

At the same time, increased pressure to commercialise research and protect the institutional brand has made universities far more 'risk averse'. This, in turn, often fuels bureaucratic closure and censorship or, more typically, 'self-censorship' as staff internalize management's norms and policies for protecting their institution's reputation. For academics, however, there is real sense that the principle of academic freedom is being undermined by an insidious 'culture of compliance' which results from centralization of power and decision-making *within* the universities, and reluctance or fear to challenge management decisions. University management teams have not only arrogated to themselves the role of 'speaking *for* the university'; increasingly, they now claim *to be* the University, and relegate staff, alumni and students to the role of 'stakeholders' – along with parents, industry and government. This discursive turn represents a major symbolic and conceptual shift in power relations and in the institutional self-awareness of NZ universities, as was illustrated in the conflict (and staff strike) that erupted in 2005 and the dispute over the University's Draft Strategic Plan.

However, conflicts over academic freedom do not only take place between management and academics. They play out at a higher level as well: between university management and the government, with the University Vice Chancellors in New Zealand warning that the government's new funding system is threatening 'institutional autonomy'.

2***. The erosion of trust and professionalism***

As in the UK, the new regime of 'quality assurance' means that the assessment criteria have to be made explicit and measurable, which entails scrutinizing mountains of documentation, producing lengthy paper trails for review, and various other technologies of 'auditability' (Power 2002). All this has generated a small industry and consultants, contractors and 'experts' who 'volunteer' to serve on the various subject review panels.

The reform process has led to the replacement of professional relationships based on collegiality and trust with a regime of measurement, performativity and surveillance. As Roberts (2007: 361-2) observes,

> It is consistent with the logic of neoliberal reform that academics, like teachers, will be regarded – explicitly or implicitly – as *untrustworthy* beings. The obsession with "accountability" under neoliberalism assumes that teachers and academics must have their "performance" monitored and assessed regularly to avoid "slacking off" or "provider capture".

This pattern seems to be part of a wider trend towards the de-professionallisation and proletarianization of academic work (Radice 2001; Harvie 2006). Hugo Radice has also written about the curious parallels between this system and the traditional Soviet model of centralized planning (Racice 2008).

3. Who are the 'new subjects' of academia?

While staff do not necessarily internalize that image of themselves, the effect of constant scrutiny and surveillance (as Foucault demonstrated long ago) can and does profoundly influence an individual's sense of self and worth. But this is consistent with the way neoliberal governmentality works: As Stephen Ball (Ball 2003) – echoing Nikolas Rose - observes, the new mode of state regulation has made it possible to govern in an 'advanced liberal' way, one that 'requires individual practitioners to organize themselves as a response to targets, indicators and evaluations. To set aside personal beliefs and commitments and live an existence of calculation'. The new 'performative worker', he argues, is 'a promiscuous self, an enterprising self, with a passion for excellence.' As Peters concludes for NZ:

> The ideal citizen, it seems, is a sophisticated, competitive, innovative and enthusiastic participant in the global economy, ever ready to apply what he or she knows (from research or other activities) to the goal of creating a "prosperous and confident nation"(PBRF Working Group 2002:4, cited in Peters 2007: 363).

The counterpart of this ideal academic subject is an ideal university graduate, who will go on to drive the 'knowledge economy':

> The current and future needs of employers and of learners demand a strong focus on the broad set of competencies needed upon graduation. According to Harvey et al, what employers want now and in the foreseeable future 'are intelligent, flexible, adaptable employees who are quick to learn and who can deal with change' (New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee 2006:5).

The new university environment creates winners and losers: for some, it provides opportunities for fast-track promotion and success in the openings within academic management. For others it 'portends inner conflicts, inauthenticity and resistance' (Ball 2003).

4. The new ethic governing academic activity?

Research assessment and teaching quality exercises have produced a culture of performativity and an institutional obsession with research ratings and rankings in international league tables of excellence. While most academic staff supported the research assessment exercise, one of its negative effects has been to cement 'more deeply in institutional consciousness than ever before' the notion that 'research is a competitive, self-interested, instrumental, outputs-oriented process' (Roberts 20007: 362). As many critics have noted, the new emphasis on performativity is supposed to encourage transparency but in reality tends to have the opposite effect, producing opacity and complicity 'as individuals and organizations take ever greater care in the construction and maintenance of fabrications' (Ball 2003). Maintaining fabrications, or 'playing the ratings game', has become an ever-more prevalent aspect of contemporary university life. However, it is not so much that a new ethic of commercialization or perforativity has come to supplant the traditional liberal/Humboldtian idea of the University; rather, we are witnessing in many universities today is a competition between contrasting models or visions of the university which are driving academic activity in a number of different and often quite contradictory ways.

References

Baert, P., and A. Shipman. 2005. University under siege? Trust and accountability in the contemporary academy. *European Societies* 7 (1):157-185.

Ball, S. J. 2003. The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy* 18 (2):215-228.

Bok, Derek Curtis. 2003. *Universities in the marketplace: the commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Bruneau, William A., Donald C. Savage, and Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2002. *Counting out the scholars : how performance indicators undermine universities and colleges*. Toronto: J. Lorimer.

Committee, New Zealand Vice-Chancellors'. 2006. The distinctive contribution of universities.

Lyotard, J.-F. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, *Theory and History of Literature, 10*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Milojevic, Ivana. 1998. Women's higher education in the 21st century. *Futures* 30 (7).

Neave, G. 2005. The supermarketed university: reform, vision and ambiguity in British higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education* 9 (1):17-22.

Olssen, M., and M. A. Peters. 2005. Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy* 20 (3):313-345.

Readings, Bill. 1996. *The University in Ruins,*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.

Smith, Dorothy. 2002. Institutional ethnography. In *Qualitative research in action*, edited by T. May. London: Sage.

Notes

[1] *Brief History:* During the 1980s, NZ underwent a major social and economic transformation that was to impact on all aspects of its culture and society. From being a highly regulated, centralized agricultural economy geared to servicing the UK market, NZ in the 1980s embraced the free-market doctrines of the Chicago School with the zeal of convert. The first country in the world to have created a welfare state and widely regarded as a model of moderate social democracy, New Zealand in 1984 also became the first country to comprehensively dismantle its welfare state. Even more striking was the fact that it was a Labour government, under David Lange, that initiated the process of deregulation and privatization that were to become the standard hallmarks of neoliberalism. Throughout the late 1980s and under the

various National governments of the 1990s, New Zealand became a laboratory for the New Right with the 'most extensive application of neo-Conservative policies in the English speaking world' (Bruneau, Savage, and Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2002)Often described as 'more Thatcherite than Mrs. Thatcher' , the 1984 Labour government sold off over an estimated $11.5 billion of state assets and set about introducing market principles and New Public Management throughout the public sector (Bruneau, Savage, and Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2002) .

Putting NZ in a wider historical and global context: the NZ tertiary education reforms are not untypical of what is happening elsewhere in world, particularly the English-speaking world, but the size of the country (4 million: 8 universities) and the radical nature of the reform process make it a useful 'laboratory' in an analytical as well as political sense. For better or worse, NZ provides a microcosm of the sort of policy changes and their effects that neoliberalization has engendered. The new Labour government of Helen Clarke elected at the end of 1999 promised to bring to a halt these Right-wing policies and sell-offs. Helen Clark has termed the present era as 'post-neoliberalism'. After 9 years under successive Labour administrations, how much has changed? From the point of view of academic staff, very little: the neoliberalizing trends set in motion in the 1990s have continued. In the view of many union officials, this was largely because the costs involved in reversing the reforms was perceived to outweigh the benefits of doing so. Also, higher education was not considered a priority by government.

[2] These are organized under Strategic Goals: 'Economic Transformation'; 'Families, Young and Old', and 'National Identity'.

[3] Lyotard predicted in 1984 that in future knowledge would become commodified and that the overarching aim of research, from the point of view of those who fund it, will be pursuit of the goal of power. "Scientists, technicians and instruments are purchased not to find truth, but to augment power" (Lyotard 1984:46)

[4] Government no longer conceptualizes universities primarily as sites for reproducing national culture, or educating people for citizenship or equipping individuals with a broad, critical liberal education. Rather, it expects universities to produce *all* of these plus its Economic Transformation Agenda, its focus on commercialization of knowledge, and its goals for social inclusion and nation-building.

[5] This scenario is based on the reality of globalisation, reduced government support, and pressure for getting funds. It is defined as student-based only in terms of students being 'consumers'. As Milojevic adds, this model is actually a reality of many universities, with directors concentrating mainly on acquiring means for further functioning. Many universities, especially in the North, are pressured to turn towards this model, if they are to survive in the future.

[6] The main focus here is on teaching - passing on of acquired knowledge to students; and research - the expansion of the knowledge base of university disciplines, although these ideals have always been challenged by external realities.

[7] This is a role that universities in the North are fast losing as government funding declines and where universities no longer serves as an ideological 'arm' of the nation state.

[8] These include government agencies, quality assurance inspectors, internal assessors, external examiners, research assessment panels; financial managers; Heads of Department or institutional line-managers, and of course, students, peers and the international research communities to which most academics belong.

[9] What began as a Labour-government led revolution was continued by the National Party throughout the 1990s.

[10] Analysts have often noted that despite the *laissez faire* rhetoric of supporters of neoliberalism and their claims to the contrary, deregulation and marketization of the public sector does not mean less government and reduced state intervention: it simply shifts state involvement and disguises government intervention through complex funding formulae and the creation of various intermediary bodies whose professed independence from government is often highly questionable.

[11] 'The new system for tertiary education will promote a much stronger focus on quality and relevance of education and research outcomes. It will ensure that tertiary education organizations identify, plan for,

and meet the needs of students, employers, industry, Maori, community groups and other stakeholders. It will do this through investing in tertiary education organizations to support and reward quality and through requiring tertiary education organizations to demonstrate that their education and research is contributing to economic, social, cultural and environmental outcomes for New Zealand and New Zealanders.' (TES 2007: 13)

[12] Instrumental measures of relevance leave little room for research such as my own, which may perform an evaluative 'critic and conscience' function and cannot easily be gauged in terms of economic and social outputs.

[13] It continues: 'UniServices limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of the University established in 1989, has become a model of its kind. It is today the largest company of its kind in Australasia, and generates over $75 million in revenue, or half of all the University's external research revenue'.