Change in Higher Education and a Core Value: Academic Freedom

Serdar Erkan

University of Saskatchewan

Yüksek öğretim kurumları da diğer örgütler gibi değişim baskısı altındadır ve değişimin planlanması, uygulanması ve yönetimi yöneticiler için önemli görev alanları yaratmaktadır. Öte yandan planlanmamış değişmelere direnebilmek de üniversitelerden beklenen bir tepki biçimidir. Planlanmış olsun ya da olmasın günümüzde yaşanan çeşitli değişmelerin bazı temel üniversite değerleri üzerinde istenmeyen yan etkileri söz konusu olabilmektedir. Bu açıdan akademik özgürlüğün korunması özel bir önem taşımaktadır. Bu araştırmanın amacı yüksek öğretimde yaşanan güncel değişmeleri ve bunların akademik özgürlüğe etkilerini değerlendirmektir. Araştırmada ele alınan konuyla ilgili literatür, yüksek öğretimde yaşanan değişimleri değişim kuramları açısından değerlendiren tartışmalarla birlikte ele alınarak sunulmuştur. Günümüzün en önemli değişim yönelimi olan ticarileşme akademik özgürlüğü yok etme açısından büyük bir potansiyele taşımaktadır. Dinsel ve siyasi hoşgörüsüzlük nedeniyle, çok kültürlülük, etnik çeşitlilik, ulusal güvenlik gibi konular da akademik özgürlük için tehdit olabilmektedir. Bilgi ve iletişim teknolojilerinin eğitime entegrasyonu gibi gelişmeler de akademik özgürlüğün sınırlanmasına yol açabilmektedir. Bütün örgütsel değişim kuramları akademik özgürlük konusunu belli bir açıdan aydınlatma gücüne sahip olmakla birlikte, akademik özgürlüğün anlaşılması, korunması ve geliştirilmesi için çoklu kuramların kullanılmasının en uygun yaklaşım olacağı söylenebilir. Değişim için çevreden gelen baskılara ek olarak üniversitenin gevşek bağlarla bağlanmış yapısı da akademik özgürlük gibi bazı temel değerlerin korunmasında sorun yaratabilir. Üniversite kültürünün bu temel değerleri, farkına bile varmadan adım adım kaybedilebilir. Bu durumda akademisyenlerin sürekli uyanık ve tetikte olması gerekir. Bu çalışmanın söz konusu anlayışın gelişmesi ve sürdürülmesine katkıda bulunması umulmaktadır.

Anahtar sözcükler: *Akademik özgürlük, yüksek öğretim, örgütsel değişim.*

Serdar Erkan

Change in Higher Education and a Core Value: Academic Freedom

Background. Institutes of higher education face many profound challenges and problems, which create a strong pressure for change in higher education. In higher education administration, planning, implementing and evaluating change or dealing with unplanned changes in an effective way, has been accepted as a crucial responsibility. Regardless of whether they are planned or unplanned, current changes have some negative side effects on core university values. Academic freedom is one of these values and it can be easily compromised.

Purpose. The purpose of this article is to assess current changes in higher education institutions in an effort to determine their effects to academic freedom.

Method. A literature review of the problem is presented along with several arguments which examine the changes as they relate to change theories.

Findings. Commercialization, which may be seen as the most important trend in higher education, has huge potential to undermine academic freedom. Religious or political intolerance, diversity, multiculturalism and national security issues may also create threats to academic freedom. Integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) into education are some other changes that may lead to problems with academic freedom. Each organizational change theory has some power to enlighten various facets of the academic freedom issue and we can benefit from multiple theories to understand, protect and develop academic freedom.

Practical Implications. This article brings this issue to the forefront in an effort to engage university administrators and educators.

Social Implications. In addition to the environmental pressure for change, the loosely coupled structure of universities is also a problem when protecting some core values such as academic freedom. These basic values of university culture may be lost, department by department, college by college, or institution by institution without people in these institutions noticing it. Academicians should always be aware and have an understanding of this issue. It is hoped that this paper will contribute to the development and/or the persistence of this awareness and understanding.

Keywords: *Academic freedom, higher education, organizational change.*

Introduction

Organizational change can be defined as "a difference in form, quality, or state over time in an organizational entity, which may be an individual's job, a work group, an organizational subunit, the overall organization, or larger communities of organizations, such as industries" (Poole & Van de Ven, 2004, p. xi). Change can be observed in many forms: planned or unplanned, incremental or radical, and recurrent or unprecedented. The causes of change are also greatly varied. Some of them are external, such as government laws and regulations, globalization of markets and the internationalization of business, major political and social events, advances in technology, growth and expansion in organizations, and fluctuations in business cycles (Dawson, 2003). There are some internal factors which affect organizational change as well: changes in the managerial personnel, deficiency in the existing organization, changes in the nature of the work force, pressure from stakeholders, and avoidance of developing inertia. On the other hand, there are some factors which may block organizational change, such as, inadequate policy-making and strategic management, existing organizational structures, power and politics in organizations, organizational cultures, individual uncertainties, and psychological resistance to change (Boonstra, 2004). Neglecting the complexity of change processes causes the failure of many organizational change programmes: "Indeed, more than 70 percent of the change programmes in organizations either stall prematurely or fail to achieve their intended result" (p.10).

The changes that higher education organizations have to manage are not exempt from this problem. Despite the fact that they have undergone radical restructuring, massive expansion, and the introduction of fundamentally new areas of scholarship, the concept behind universities has remained largely unchanged for over 800 years, because they protect their core mission and some artefacts, rituals, and symbols (Bates, 2010). They have resisted change and have been working in the same manner in many aspects for hundreds of years (Cross, 2010). However, the environment is not the same, because the nature and pace of change have transformed and are faster than ever today (Cross, 2010). Higher education institutes face many profound challenges and problems, which create a strong pressure for change in higher education.

For higher education administration, planning, implementing and evaluating change or dealing with unplanned changes in an effective way has been accepted as a crucial responsibility. To fulfill this responsibility, it is vital to understand the complexity and the necessity of change in higher

education as well as the need for protecting some core values by resisting change. In this paper, these topics are discussed.

Nature of Higher Education

Higher education can be defined as "all types of studies, training or training for research at the post-secondary level, provided by universities or other educational establishments that are approved as institutions of higher education by the competent State authorities" (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 1993, p. 132). Higher education institutes have some distinctive characteristics that differentiate them from ordinary organizations. Some of these characteristics are (Kezar, 2001): "Interdependence in the organization, relatively independence from the environment, unique culture of the academy, institutional status, value-driven, multiple power and authority structures, loosely coupled system, organized anarchical decision making, professional and administrative values, shared governance, employee commitment and tenure, goal ambiguity, image, and success" (p. 61). These features may be observed in different weights in various types of institutions. All higher education institutions, regardless of whether they are public or private, non-profit or for-profit, colleges or research universities, technical or professional schools, serve a public purpose. In spite of differences in their quality, purpose, and aspirations, all of them are crucial in the socio-cultural and economic development of countries and societies. They can be seen through different lenses. These lenses can be summarized as 'higher education as a social institution' or 'higher education as an industry'. These two approaches can be seen together in different weights as well.

Higher education can be accepted as an engine for the economy. For example, according to the World Bank (2002), higher education principally serves as a source of human capital for the modern labour market, and as an engine of innovation, research, and development for the economy by providing necessary skills and knowledge. In this sense, higher education should accomplish the following purposes: "a) be a major contributor to economic success; b) produce, exchange, and transfer cutting edge knowledge from research; and c) produce graduates with appropriate skills and knowledge" (Cochrane & Williams, 2010, p. 22). In summary, education is accepted as an engine for economy.

On the other hand, higher education can be seen as an agent of social transformation (Gupta, 2008). Higher education helps integrate individuals, firms, and national societies into the global world society. It also recognizes and supports new social identities and statuses, which affects global and

domestic civil society, social movements, and political reforms. Contribution to the creation of a more socially inclusive society is an additional expectation of universities. "Universities have frequently been regarded as key institutions, in training and socialising members of new social elites, in processes of social change and development, and in encouraging and facilitating new cultural values" (Brennan, King & Lebeau, 2004, p. 16). The World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century suggested many social expectations that reflect the complexity and extent of the social tasks of contemporary higher education (World Conference on Higher Education, 1998).

Because of expanded roles and expectations of higher education in modern society, higher education institutes have become more complex. Some other foundations that create this complexity are as follows (Bess & Dee, 2008):

- The interactions of institutions with the varying demands of their external environments.
- The increased structural differentiation and specialization of functions of academic and non-academic departments.
- The variation in expectations and human needs of workers in, and clients of, institutions.
- The variations in norms and values within an institution.(p.16)

The challenges higher education institutes have faced, and the trends they will be influenced by, are making the situation much more complex for university administrators. The main challenges for today's universities can be summarized as follows: Financing, accountability, quality of teaching, research and service, staff development, relevance of programmes, globalization, lifelong learning, ICT adoption into all levels of education, ubiquitous learning, affordable education, diversity, international and intercultural education, and new forms and patterns of universities (Alexander, 2007; Ehlers & Schneckenberg, 2010; UNESCO, 1998).

Coping with these challenges and being ready for the scenarios of the future requires strong, effective and proactive organizations, but today's universities have been struggling with many organizational problems. Bees and Dee (2008) grouped these problems as follows: 1. Competition and external relations. 2. Planning and budgeting 3. Organizational structure and core processes. 4. Managing departments and institutional units. 5. Managing groups and teams 6. Change management and organizational growth. 7. Personnel management. 8. Mission, vision, and goals for the organization. 9. Diversity and quality of work life.

353

The challenges, trends and organizational problems in higher education institutes create a large amount of pressure on higher education, where each challenge is a powerful drive for change. Today, the necessity of organizational change in higher education cannot be ignored.

Organizational Change in Higher Education

The explanations about the nature of organizational change vary according to the theories they are based on. Since almost every organizational theory has mentioned change in some way, it is possible to find a large number of theories on this issue. Some authors have suggested various classifications to simplify this multiplicity of theories. For example, Weick and Quinn (1999) classified the theories in terms of the tempo of change. They suggest two types of change: episodic and continuous change. Nordvall (1982) classified only planned change theories (or models). According to him, the main models are as follows: a) Research, development, and diffusion (rational planning), b) social interaction, c) political (conflict), d) linkage, e) adaptive development. Poole and Van de Ven (1995) reviewed 20 process theories and suggested four basic theories to explain processes of change in organizations: Life cycle, teleological, dialectical, and evolutionary theories. Kezar (2001) added two more grouped theories: social cognition and cultural theories.

Another approach to change is the usage of multiple models. Poole and Van de Ven (1995) suggest sixteen different combinations of four change model types. In their approach, each of them addresses different aspects of organizational life. Morgan (1986) defends the theory that a combination of evolutionary, dialectical, and cognitive theories is the best representation of organizational change. Similarly, Rajagopalan and Spreitzer (1996) suggest a similar combination that includes cognitive, evolutionary, and scientific management theories as a model of strategic change. According to them, each allays a weakness of the other. Bolman and Deal (1991) also present a multiple model to explain change. They defend that people in organizations have unique ways to approach and act. Leaders, by usage of a combination of various theories or lenses, can identify the problems more precisely and find effective solutions. They suggested human resources, structural, political, and symbolic lenses were suggested as aspects of multidimensional thinking.

When organizational change theories and the nature of higher education are reviewed, it is clearly visible that there is no particular theory that is enough to explain or manage the changes that have taken place in higher education. Each institute may require a different approach, or each theory may explain

change in a dimension of higher education. From another perspective, each theory has strengths and weaknesses. By using multiple models, it is possible to combine the insights of various change theories and eliminate their weaknesses. An example of this approach can be seen in Hearn's (1996) recommendations. He emphasizes the importance of cultural and political models to understand and facilitate change. In addition, he also highlights the resource dependency of higher education organizations and the necessity for both disruption and accretion.

Similarly, Kezar (2001) suggested a combination of cultural, social-cognition, and political models. The emphasis on values, the strong organizational identification, the embeddedness of members who create and reproduce the history and values, as well as multiple organizational subcultures are the main rationale for the existence of cultural models in this multiple model. Social cognition models are also necessary, because image and identification are crucial in understanding whether change is occurring and if so, how it occurs. In addition, some higher education characteristics, such as: the loosely coupled structure, anarchical decision-making, and ambiguous goals, make the meaning unclear. Then, because social-cognition models emphasize multiple interpretations, they may be important to consider when examining and facilitating change. Political models are also needed because of the following characteristics of higher education: the shared governance system, organized anarchy, conflicting administrative and professional values, and ambiguous, competing goals. According to Kezar (2001), evolutionary models are also important to understand the influence of environmental factors on change.

Generally, positivist approaches are employed for planned changes, while the social constructivist approach is employed mainly for facilitating the emergent change. Certainly, other models may also be recommended, according to ideology or philosophy embraced, or situation. Bess and Dee (2008) advocate that "the more that a change model leads to increase in human resource development, the more effective the organization will be (p. 813)". They identified some additional contingencies to determine the combination of the change models. These contingencies are as follows: the structure for action, leadership capacities at all levels, the culture of trust, financial slack, external environmental constraints, and opportunities. In their opinion, after the analysis of contingencies which should be employed, it can be seen that some of them may require usage of a planned change model, while others require emergent models. That situation also reflects the need for multiple models.

Until this point, change is presented as a required, desired, favourable, inevitable process. However, there is another side of change that may create hesitation, suspicion, worry, and even fear. Some concerns related to change are argued below.

Is there something we should not change?

Questions can be used to discuss the existence of various traditional elements of higher education. For example (Hooker, 1997);

> If we focus on learning, there are many traditions that we might question. Where is the proof that accumulating 120 credit hours makes a person educated? What does the baccalaureate degree certify? How did we come to believe that education parceled out in 50-minute increments, three times a week, was optimum for all of our students? What caused educators to decide that the length of the semester should be constant while student learning is allowed to vary? Why did we decide that mastery of the subject was less important than the time spent in the classroom? (para. 23)

Many more questions in different aspects of higher education may be added to these, such as are there untouchable traditional elements? For instance, might the core values of university culture: an interest in knowledge for its own sake, critical thinking, exhaustive inquiry, specialized knowledge, disputation, openness, scepticism, tolerance, reflection, honesty, respect for intellectual property, collegiality, critique, and academic freedom, be questionable? When the crucial roles of these questions of higher education are considered, the answer should be "no". But, change or transformation efforts target these values directly and indirectly. In this paper, academic freedom is chosen as an example of a core value at risk, and some arguments about this subject are given below.

Academic Freedom

Academic freedom commonly means "the freedom of professors to teach, research, and publish, to criticize and help determine the policies of their institutions, and to address public issues as citizens, without fear of institutional penalties" (Horn, 2002, Para. 1). It is one of the most important values in academia. It can even be considered as the most important one. It provides an environment in which academics and students can freely exchange ideas, challenge conventional wisdom and debate controversial issues (MacDonald & Williams, 2006). This environment is crucial for educating students and advancing human knowledge. In addition, it is a means to achieve a more democratic society. "Academic freedom has played a significant role in promoting the public good and democratic values by fostering free inquiry and the open exchange of ideas"

(Tierney & Lechuga, 2010, p. 118). In spite of its noble status in academia, this value has always been attacked. For example, almost one century ago, academic freedom was criticized as follows (The New York Times, 1916):

> "Academic freedom," that is, the inalienable right of every college instructor to make a fool of himself and his college by vealy, intemperate, sensational prattle about every subject under heaven, to his classes and to the public, and still keep on the payroll or be reft therefrom only by elaborate process, is cried to all the winds by the organized dons (para. 1).

Currently, there are also some assaults directed against academic freedom. Some of them are open and on behalf of change or transformation, while the others are implicit and are the side effects of change efforts. Nelson (2010) listed 16 major threats to academic freedom:

> 1. Instrumentalization. 2. Contingency. 3. Authoritarian administration. 4. Abuses of the national security state. 5. Administration restrictions on the use of communication technology. 6. Unwarranted research oversight. 7. Neoliberal assaults on academic disciplines. 8. Managerial ideology. 9. Circumvention of shared governance. 10. Globalization. 11. Opposition to human rights. 12. Inadequate grievance procedures. 13. Religious intolerance. 14. Political intolerance. 15. Legal threats. 16. Claims of financial crisis (p. 53-59).

It is possible to classify these threats into three groups: (a) Commercialization and its side effects, (b) social, cultural, and political issues and (c) technological change.

Commercialization and its side effects

Many threats presented above have arisen, directly or indirectly, as a result of commercialization in higher education. Commercialization can be defined as the marketing of academic work, that is, the sale of academic expertise to provide funding for higher education institutions (Kayrooz, Kinnear & Preston, 2001). Because of some factors such as: reduced governmental funding, competition among universities, and the innovation policies of governments, which encourage universities to commercialise their research, many universities accept funding from industry and engage in commercial activities (Sterckx, 2006). However, there may be a reverse explanation for this cause – effect situation.

> The cause may be the desire to link universities more closely to industry; to privatize public higher education and subject it to market forces; to harness and manage university research as an engine for economic growth; to prioritize and promote the creation of knowledge for private profit and the effect may be reduced governmental findings (Graham, 2000, p. 23).

No matter what the cause is or what the effect is, commercialization has an increasing tendency all over the world. For Canadian universities, this tendency can be observed, as well (Bellefeuille, 2005; Rasmussen, 2008). The increase in commercialization has made the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada proud of their success and has encouraged them to commit towards tripling their commercialization performance (AUCC, 2003). Of this, the question may be asked: If it is an important target for universities, or something to be proud of when it is realized, what is the issue? The issue is that commercialization not only brings funds or income but also some problems; and some of them are not new. It is possible to claim that business interference has always been present in academia. At the end of the nineteenth century, social critic Thorstein Veblen noted that those who make donations to the universities were trying to build up their reputations (Johnson, Kavanagh & Mattson; 2003). They wanted their names on buildings and to show their connections to prestigious universities. "If some professor espoused radical politics, the pressure might be turned on, and said professor would hit the pavement. Trustees called the shots, no doubt, making clear that wealth spoke clearly and audibly in the hallowed halls of academia even a century ago" (p. 2).However, current business leaders desire more than that. They are trying to possess not only influence but also much more control over the educational processes.

> They don't want ivory-covered buildings with their names on them but rather training camps for their workforce. They probably don't even care all that much if nutty left-wing profs shoot their mouths off. ... Corporate leaders want their employees to gain knowledge now, immediately, not on the plodding terms set by the ivory tower of yesteryear but the terms set by corporations, providing only enough knowledge for their employees to get their jobs done, not to ask fundamental questions about the society in which they live. ... The message is clear: So long, ivy-covered walls, tweedy professors, and genteel university presidents—hello to markets, profits, and computers (Johnson, Kavanagh & Mattson, 2003, p. 3).

In addition to gaining influence through academic programs, business leaders are also trying to direct the purposes of research with their donations and the public funds which are linked to the partnerships with industry (Graham, 2000). Of course, the chosen purposes will be commercially exploitable, and because of the commercial nature of the produced knowledge, it will not be a public good any more. The knowledge becomes intellectual property, and it is protected by donation agreements against the threat of academic freedom.

Soley (1995) highlighted the negative effects of commercialization on teaching standards. According to him, since a professor's research and grant-obtaining record has become the most important determinant, the

importance of teaching has been reduced. In addition, the teaching responsibilities of the professors who conduct research studies are reduced, in order to provide enough time to conduct their research. "This reduction has increased class sizes, reduced professors' motivation to teach, and increased the number of classes taught by graduate students. And while the corporate grant may cover the direct cost of the research, students and taxpayers pay the salaries of the professors working on the corporate grant projects" (p. 85). Furthermore, because the corporate grant projects are perceived as more prestigious by journal editors, they are quickly accepted for publishing. Additionally, these journals are stocked with socially trivial articles. According to Soley (1995), another basis for the problem of the trivialization of social science research is related to academic freedom. Professors will not jeopardize their position by publishing articles that criticize the donor corporations. They know that the result of this kind of action may result in them being ostracized or even terminated.

Unfortunately, there are negative examples regarding this problem. The case of Dr. Nancy Olivieri, professor of paediatrics, medicine, and public health sciences at the University of Toronto, is one of them.

> In 1997, while conducting a clinical trial of a drug that showed promise for improving the lives of patients with thalassemia – a blood disorder that can be fatal if not treated – Dr. Olivieri reported that she discovered what she considered to be possibly life-threatening side effects of the medication. She said that she informed the pharmaceutical company of this risk and of her intention to notify the hospital's Research Ethics Board, her patients, and other clinicians. According to Dr. Olivieri, the company disagreed with her findings, informed her that such actions would be in violation of a confidentiality agreement she had signed, and warned of "legal remedies" if she carried out her intentions.

> After publishing her findings, Dr. Olivieri suffered a series of adverse actions, including being relieved of one of her positions and referral to a physicians' disciplinary board. A report on the case – completed by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) – states that anonymous letters to journalists and several colleagues, accusing Dr. Olivieri of professional and sexual misconduct, were later traced to a colleague who had received money from the company. The CAUT reported further that the university where she had an appointment, which had been promised a large donation by the company, supported her only after an investigation by the Association and the physicians' board had vindicated her. Dr. Olivieri continues to fight legal battles brought against her by the drug company. (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2010, p. 3-4)

In addition to overt obstacles caused by commercialization, there may be hidden influences related to academic freedom. The findings of Stelfox, Chua, O'Rourke and Detsky (1998), may provide some evidence for this statement. They researched 70 published articles about the safety of calcium-channel antagonists, in order to examine the authors' published positions on the safety

of calcium-channel antagonists according to their financial relationships with pharmaceutical companies. They used independent reviewers to classify each paper as supporters, neutral, or critical of calcium-channel antagonists, and gathered data regarding authors' funding sources using a questionnaire. According to the results; authors who supported the use of calcium channel antagonists were significantly more likely than the others to have financial relationships with manufacturers. Then, it may be claimed that commercialization affects researchers' objectivity as well as their inclination to reveal all of the results they have reached. In summary, the major negative effects of the commercialization trend can be listed as follows (Preston, Kinnear & Kayrooz, 2001):

- Governmental pressures for universities, to develop alternative sources of income through commercialization, were interacting to create work overload and to reduce independent research time. The trend towards commercial activities meant that academics spent considerable amounts of time writing competitive tenders and developing and marketing commercial courses, in addition to their normal workload.
- The pressure, to engage in attracting research funding from industry, increasingly channelled academic effort into 'safe, well defined' areas of research, rather than speculative ones.
- The emphasis on fee-based courses benefited disciplines that were vocational, rather than speculative and critical, and they sometimes redirected academics' teaching focus to areas that were tangential to academics' expertise.
- The drive to market flexible fee-based courses, particularly on-line courses and distance packages, challenged academics' ownership of intellectual material.
- The emphasis on fee-based courses, in particular for domestic and international postgraduates, was thought to undermine teaching standards.
- The emphasis on 'market' demand required more corporate management structures in universities, which, in turn, compromised collegial decision making structures (p. 43).

Regarding the issue of commercialization, where should an academician be positioned? One possibility is to see himself or herself in a position similar to that of Marx (1867, cited in Smith, 2000), who held a perception that reflects some assumptions of the current trend of commercialization.

A schoolmaster is a productive labourer, when, in addition belabouring the heads of his scholars, he works like a horse to enrich the school proprietor. That the latter has laid out his capital in a teaching factory, instead of a sausage factory, does not alter the relation (p. 330).

Defenders of commercialization not only see universities as business organizations, they also blame classical stereotypical academicians for being disconnected from real world (Johnson, Kavanagh & Mattson; 2003). "Academics care only about the realms of culture and language —those

abstract realms that they themselves inhabit. They are the type that the right-wing populist George Wallace complained about during the late 1960s— pointy headed intellectuals who can't park their bikes straight" (p. 1).

On the other hand, an academic can choose different side to be positioned and defend opposing ideas. For example, according to Woodhouse (2009),

> market models and education have opposing goals, motivations, methods and standards of excellence; and "universities have to ensure their independence from the market so that they remain capable of sustaining academic freedom and the critical search for knowledge. In order to prevent the liquidation of these defining characteristics, universities must move beyond the narrow assumptions of the market model and rejuvenate their own distinctive goals, motivations, methods and standards of excellence (p. 45)".

Similarly, Graham (2000) highlights the differences between the market model and academic freedom approaches. According to him, scholars and scientists are not entrepreneurs. Scholars have the desire to know, not the desire to sell, and this desire is one of the most basic human drives. Scholars and scientists' faith in knowledge requires the protection of academic freedom and scholarly/scientific integrity. On the other hand, the entrepreneur's drive is to market his products, and he does not have any values equivalent to academic freedom. His priorities are in paying his bills and abiding by the laws, developing products, and maximizing his profits.

As a solution to this dilemma, a balance between two approaches is recommended by various authors. For example, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (2001) recommended the following principle to protect academic freedom, while strongly encouraging commercialization.

Consequently, AUCC members recognize the need to adopt a balanced approach that takes into consideration not only the protection of intellectual property and investors' legitimate economic interests but also students' freedom to publish their research results. Such a balanced approach appears to be the norm as increasingly institutions have rules protecting new intellectual property for a finite period, often of six months. This approach seems to provide sufficient time for the initiation of the legal process to protect IP without compromising students' academic progress (p. 5).

However, establishing this kind of balanced approach is not an easy task. Graham (2000) indicates this difficulty as follows: scholarship and entrepreneurship have extremely different cultures and life styles. "Some

individuals manage to balance two such lives, but it is never easy: they risk turning a silk ear into a pig's purse" (p. 27). Even if the balance is established, it may not be easy to remove all side effects of commercialization by taking only balancing measures. For example, employing non-tenure track faculty can be seen as a result of commercialization or as a managerial approach to university governance, which is a powerful threat to academic freedom. Because of the importance of tenure, it deserves a separate discussion.

Gypsy Scholars

"Gypsy scholars" is a term used to describe "people engaged in scholarly teaching and research activities without the benefits of income security, institutional support, tenure-guaranteed academic freedom and access to traditional avenues of research grant funding that normally accrue to scholars engaged in full-time faculty positions" (Fenwick, 2005, p. 116). Fugitive scholars, independent academics, portfolio professionals (Fenwick, 2005), road scholars, and freeway flyers (Nutting, 2003) are some other epithets used to define the same group of academics. These identifiers are used because the academics are always moving from one campus to another. Since many universities put limit on the number of hours part-time faculty can teach on one campus, they have to work at three, or four, different schools to earn enough income (Tillyer, 2005). Their percentage in academia has been increasing rapidly, and this increase creates some negative results in terms of academic freedom.

According to the data presented in the Report on Faculty and Instructional Staff in Fall 2003; three of every five (60%) faculty members held a non-tenure track position and between 1987 and 2003, the percentage of faculty who were tenured/tenure-track decreased by 15% in higher education institutions in the United States (Cataldi, Fahimi & Bradburn, 2005). The American Association of University Professors (1993) criticized this tendency as follows:

> The AAUP is concerned about institutions which persist in practices that undermine or destroy the stability of tenure and academic freedom, including practices that exploit non-tenure-track faculty. Institutions that rely heavily on non-tenure-track faculty members to teach undergraduate students undermine the institution's respect for teaching and the reputation of higher education in the larger society. Institutions exploit faculty members when they appoint numerous, part-time faculty in a single department, or renew "temporary" faculty members year after year without offering them raises in pay, access to benefits, opportunities for promotion, or eligibility for tenure (para. 27).

The same tendency is valid for Canadian universities, as well. Between 1990–1991 and 1997–1998, the number of part-time faculty in Canada increased 10%; from 25,700 in 1990–1991 to 28,200 in 1997– 1998 (Omiecinski, 2003, p.10). The proportion of non-permanent university professors had doubled between 1999 and 2005: from 15.5% to 31.7% (Lin, 2006). The Canadian Association of University Teachers (2005) brought the same problem to the agenda. According to the association, non-tenure track faculty have many problems such as: job security problems, low wages, a heavy teaching load, substantial outside work, little time and no institutional support for research and scholarly activity, professional marginalization, and vulnerability to student pressure. In addition "since non-tenure track faculty can be dismissed at the end of their term without any administrator having to provide a reason, without any due process and without any rights to appeal, it would not be realistic to expect behaviours that reflect academic freedom such as: the expression of controversial ideas, adaptation of unique teaching practices, or criticism of university administration" (p. 5). According to CAUT, university administrations should be forced to return to providing permanent, secure jobs as the norm for academic staff, in order to maintain the academic freedom, quality and integrity of universities. The situation of non-tenure track faculty is described more sentimentally by Purcell (2007):

> Temps, adjuncts, lecturers, part-timers, non-tenure tracks: there is a growing majority of faculty in the American academy that isn't quite real. They are not fully there. They are in limbo in every sense of the word. They are not graduate students; they are not *really* members of the faculty. They are in between. And they are waiting for something to break, for the door to open, for their career to begin. Meanwhile, they move in the shadows, teaching the big introductory classes, providing indispensable service to their department, and drawing little in return in terms of salary or office space. They begin their career—publishing, teaching, attending conferences—even as they choke back the fear that their career will never really begin. They try feverishly to earn a tenure-track job, but they cannot know, and they have no control over, whether their limbo will end happily or tragically (p. 121-122).

The results of a survey, conducted by the Association and Organization of American Historians Joint Committee on Part-Time Teaching (Townsend & Hauss, 2002), shows that this description is not too pessimistic. According to the findings:

- 83 % of the part-timers returning surveys had no health insurance
- 82 % had no access professional development funds,
- 72 % had no retirement plan,
- 78 % had no access travel funds,
- 42 % had no access to computers,
- 27 % had no office space to meet students,

- 26 % had no office telephone numbers,
- 8 % had no access to photocopy services, and
- 8 % had no library access.

Under these conditions, academic freedom most probably would not be a priority for these academicians. Some recommendations to cope with this problem are given below.

- To limit the percentage of part-time faculty to a reasonable level. The AAUP (1993) recommendation was 15%, but I do not think this recommendation is realistic today.
- Providing reasonable assurance of continued employment, following successful completion of a probationary period (AAUP 1993).
- Giving opportunity to participate in university governance.
- Increasing their wages and benefits.

However, in my belief, the most important step will be providing tenured faculty support. For example, faculty associations and faculty unions can force university administrations to convert part-time and temporary positions into full-time and permanent ones (Bauder, 2006). If they stay uninterested in their temporary colleagues' problems, the problems will affect them as well. CAUT (2005) emphasized the necessity of their support by the following statement. "Tenured and tenure-track staff face a stark choice: help win salary, working conditions and other rights comparable to their own for contract academic staff, or watch their own situation gradually decline to that suffered by their contract colleagues" (p. 6). Purcell (2007) explains the situation as follows:

> "It is a classic neoliberal strategy: hiring new workers at significantly more meagre terms than current workers enjoy. In this scenario no one currently on the tenure track would lose their tenure, but they would leave behind an academy staffed entirely by the non-tenure tracks they so assiduously ignored. If we want to resist a neo-liberalized university without job security, academic freedom, living wages, or benefits, we must all begin to pay far more attention to the plight of faculty outside the tenure track. More than that, we must consciously carve, out of a system that actively prevents it, a way for them to narrate their experience and mobilize their resistance" (p. 131).

Social, cultural, and political issues

Diversity, multiculturalism and national security issues may also create threats to academic freedom. Because of religious and political intolerance, it is becoming more difficult to express opinions even for the sake of opening a discussion. The expression of any idea which may be perceived as offensive by any group may create consequences as follows (Leiser, 1994):

- An adverse impact on the reputation of the college or university in the community at large;
- Serious declines in student enrolment and retention, with a concomitant drop in tuition income;
- Threats by alumni and other potential donors to refuse to contribute to the institution's endowment;
- The possibility of a reduction or withdrawal of support from the state legislature;
- The threat of direct or indirect action by state or federal administrative agencies or legislative committees which might launch investigations of the institution (thus bringing about even more bad publicity), enact sanctions against it, or interfere with its academic or scholarly activities;
- Interjection of governing boards into the day-to-day management of the institution;
- An escalation in the number and prominence of reports in the media, generating even more threats of the type described above;
- Demands by alumni, legislators, supporters, trustees, and editorial writers, that the offending professor be removed (p. 23).

Acknowledgement of risks given above can create hesitation in expressing ideas, claims, opinions, or scientific data. Borrows (2009) presented some example claims. According to him, an academic has the right to make any of these claims even though all of them are probably offensive to some people and some of them do not represent truth. Those claims are below (p. 183-186):

- 'The notion of honour killings is abhorrent'
- 'Research shows that blacks on average have lower I.Q.s than whites'
- 'European culture is in various ways superior to Inuit culture'
- 'Psychological creativity tests are misconceived nonsense'
- 'The Nazis didn't behave too badly in Paris'
- '6 million Jews were not murdered in the holocaust', this figure being a great exaggeration.
- 'Universities should divest themselves of corporate sponsorship'
- 'This work is poor', as said to students when it is judged to be so'
- 'Extremely handicapped individuals should not be included in the regular classroom'

Borrows (2009) believes that academic freedom should be absolute and free of constraints. Badley (2009) also advocates similar ideas.

> Academic freedom requires that 'Only when we are prepared to allow our own most sacred cows to be poked in the eye can we credibly demand that Islamists, Turks and others do the same. This is a time not for erecting taboos but for dismantling them. We must practice what we preach (Ash, 2006)'. Academic freedom for historians and scientists must also include academic freedom for Holocaust deniers and scientific creationists (if that is not an oxymoron)" (p. 157).

In this situation, academics may choose a politically correct rhetoric that creates a superficial or fake but personally safe and secure climate, or an

authentic, honest, daring rhetoric which creates a free climate that allows academics and students to compete or clash their ideas against one another.

Unwarranted research oversight is another thread that may be mentioned under the 'social, cultural and political issues' heading. Many universities have established some regulations require prior approval of some boards, such as institutional review boards or ethic committees, to begin a research. Nelson (2009) criticized these committees as follows.

The unworkable demands IRBs have made include requirements for consent that indigenous peoples do not have the cultural context to comprehend, absurd objections to the psychological damage survey questions can cause, and even rejection of proposed protocols for student conversations with family members. Cumbersome and intrusive IRB procedures have had a chilling effect and caused faculty to delay or abandon research projects and lesson plans (Nelson, 2009, p. 694-695).

In spite of the existence of some ethically problematic examples such as *The Tuskegee Syphilis Study*, these procedures seem excessive and should be loosened.

Technological change

Integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) into education is an indispensable part of almost every change project. At first glance, it appears to be a very innocent action that deserves utmost support by academia. However, the statements of Massy and Zemsky (1995) may change our first impression.

> Foremost among the barriers to IT's full adoption is a set of established institutional norms relating to teaching methods, faculty autonomy, and notions of productivity. The set of teaching-method-norms include such considerations as teaching loads, student-teacher ratios, and class sizes. Optimizing the use of information technology requires faculty to change what they clearly prefer to leave untouched. The very interconnectivity of the new information technologies similarly challenges the faculty's definitions of autonomy, which dictate that a professor can individually decide what, when, and where he or she teaches. Finally, faculty will have little interest in IT's capacities to boost academic productivity to the extent that they lack an appropriate vision of learning productivity (para. 21).

Are the excuses such as "Optimizing the use of IT" and "the very interconnectivity of the new information technology" satisfying enough to sacrifice academic freedom? In my view, the answer should be "no". The tools or methods and values are in different layers of organizational culture and academic freedom as a basic or core value takes place at deeper levels (Schein, 1992). If any arrangement is necessary, to realize it on the

artefacts level will be much easier and more reasonable. In other words; usage of ICT and keeping academic freedom, without changing its definition or its limits, is possible. If we have to change something, we can change definitions of some concepts such as "full adaptation" or "optimizing the use of IT". Otherwise, we can be replaced by "automatic professor machines", as Winner (2000) states to satirize information technology applications.

Change Theories and Academic Freedom

In this part of the paper, academic freedom will be discussed briefly in terms of some change theories. These include evolutionary, life cycle, teleological, political, social cognition, and cultural theories. According to evolutionary theories, change is a response to environmental conditions faced by organizations (Morgan, 1986). It occurs gradually and managers do not have the power to plan and respond to the change. Environmental demands for change are vital for the survival of the organization. If we assume that these opinions are correct, we will certainly lose our academic freedom to some degree (if we have not already lost it), because of strong the environmental demands mentioned above. However, there are less deterministic evolutionary ideas which defend that managers can speed up or slow down the adaptation processes through their actions (Cameron, 1984). Furthermore, some evolutionary theorists advocate that adaptation can be proactive and anticipatory, as well (March, 1994). Then, we can say that in spite of the deterministic nature of the evolutionary theories, there are still actions to be taken for preventing the erosion of academic freedom.

Life cycle theories also view change as an unavoidable natural process, but in this approach, leaders have more power because they guide the individual's natural growth (Kezar, 2001). Two assumptions may make us pessimistic or optimistic regarding academic freedom. The first one is the deterministic nature of change and its stages ends with "decline". That may mean that academic freedom will also inevitably decline. On the other hand, organizational identity is very important in this approach; therefore people can resist the change because of identity. If academic freedom can be made a core value of organizational identity (supposedly, it is), change will not be easy.

Teleological theories, due to their overly rational and linear nature, do not seem suitable for understanding the changes in academic freedom. In teleological theories, change occurs because the leader, change agents, or others see the need for change and leadership (Kezar, 2001). While

leadership is very important, individuals in the organizations are neglected in this approach. Since academic freedom is an important right and value for individuals in academia, it would not be a wise approach to try to change or protect the understanding of academic freedom by neglecting people.

The political approach may be considered one of the most appropriate approaches to explain changes in academia, including academic freedom. Its many assumptions are applicable towards the changes discussed in this paper. Organizations are places in which opposing polar ideas and belief systems clash (Kezar, 2001). These clashes may result in radical changes. Conflict is seen as a natural part of human interaction as well as of bargaining, persuasion and forming coalitions. The result of conflicts may not be rational, nor produce better organization. When higher education institutes are examined, there are different external interest groups. Although this approach neglects the environmental influences, we can predict that internal groups have external supporter and opposition as well. The groups have different, even opposite, opinions about the nature and future of higher education. We should be certain that at least some of them are sensitive about academic freedom issue, in order to protect academic freedom. However, the existence of this type of group may not create a desired result, because if we start to bargain or negotiate on academic freedom, we may also have to make a concession on it.

The social cognition approach is different from the others given above, because of its phenomenological or social constructivist approach. This approach defends that change is a learning process (Kezar, 2001). Similar to the way in which the brain works, change in organizations is built on past institutional knowledge. An environmental demand, a leader's vision, a developmental challenge, or dialectical tension is not necessary for change. Change is a result of individual learning. Proponents of this approach also believe that change may not be progressive and positive. In my belief, the key concept in this approach is interpretation. The perceptions of both leaders and individuals are the most important factors to understand and manage change. If we do not know how people perceive, understand and interpret academic freedom, we cannot protect or develop academic freedom by using only functionalist approaches.

Cultural theories can be seen as another very strong approach, among others. As mentioned above, academic freedom is an important value that takes place in the middle layer of university culture, and change in academic freedom is more difficult than with artefacts on the surface of university culture. This is because values are built on basic assumptions of organizational culture (Schein, 1992). If values are to be changed, the

assumption needs to be targeted first, but this approach may not work in the university environment. Schein's theory assumes that every organization has a culture that is accepted by all individuals in the organization. Subcultures are neglected in this approach, but it is obvious that the administrators' point of view may differ from those of faculty, regarding academic freedom, in the same university; or different approaches may be observed in different departments. This situation requires a more interpretive cultural approach to understand every subgroups perspective regarding academic freedom. Furthermore, because different subcultures within the same organization may experience environmental pressures, demands, or expectations differently (Martin & Frost, 1996), they may react to these factors differently. "They may have different kinds and rates of change (p. 604)". This may be a reasonable explanation for the relatively different perceptions of academic freedom between natural sciences and social sciences. In summary, it is possible to say that each organizational change theory has some power to enlighten various facets of the academic freedom issue. The suggestions made above, regarding organizational change in higher education, are valid for this issue, as well. We can benefit from multiple theories to understand, protect, and develop academic freedom.

Conclusion

As a senior academic, I am not comfortable with the notion of change in higher education because some changes I have experienced did not make me happy. However, regardless of my personal experiences, I know that universities cannot survive without change. While almost everything has been changing around it, the university cannot persist as an ivory tower. Since the drives to change are undeniable and very powerful, higher education institutions have to plan, implement and evaluate change continuously. They also have to facilitate unplanned or emergent changes. To fulfill these responsibilities, employing multiple organizational change theories would be a wise decision, because each of the change theories has some advantages and disadvantages. In addition, one model or theory may be more suitable for some changes than others. Another issue is quality of change. Higher education institutes should be very sensitive in protecting the core values of university culture. It is obvious that some current trends may create negative impacts on values such as academic freedom.

Commercialization, which may be seen as the most important trend, has created opportunity, as well as problems for universities. Transforming traditional universities into corporations can lead to many dangers for academia, academics, students and society. De Maret (2004) uses church and

supermarket metaphors for this situation and recommends that universities find a place between the two of them. In spite of its risks mentioned above, this balanced place for universities seems the most reasonable solution, although personally I would prefer to be a church officer rather than a salesman. The situation of temporary faculty is also related to the commercialization issue, and as I mentioned above, solidarity between tenured and non-tenured faculty is a key solution to this problem.

In my belief, academics should be free of any constraints to express their ideas, beliefs, and data, especially if they are produced by scientific methods. However, it should not be forgotten that their ideas do make sense if they keep their status in public opinion, and that protecting this higher status responsibility and auto-control are maintained as basic necessities.

I am aware that there are potential misuses of some values in higher education. For example, an academic may defend his bad teaching attitude or behaviours by using his academic freedom, or he or she may abuse the right to expressing ideas freely. However, there are internal mechanisms to cope with this kind of misbehaviour, and protect academic freedom. These abnormalities should not be excuses for changing core values. In addition to the pressure, the loose coupled structure of universities, which is considered as a barrier for change, is also a problem for maintaining these values. We may lose the basic values of university culture, department by department, college by college, or institution by institution without our noticing. We should always be aware of this issue. The establishment of committees in the universities, to monitor and protect core values, may be one of the first steps to be taken.

References

Alexander, F.K. (2007). Balancing the challenges of today with the promise of tomorrow: a presidential perspective. In d'Ambrosio, M.B. & Ehrenberg, R. G. *Transformational change in higher education positioning colleges and universities for future success* (pp.16-29). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar

Badley, G. (2009). A place from where to speak: The university and academic freedom. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 57*(2), 146-163.

Bates, T. (2010). New challenges for universities: Why they must change. In U.D Ehlers & _D_Schneckenberg (Eds). *Changing cultures in higher education moving ahead to future learning* (pp.15-26). Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Bauder, H. (2006). The segmentation of academic labour: A Canadian example. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 4*(2), 228-239.

Bellefeuille, G. (2005). Estimation of research and development expenditures in the higher education sector, 2003-2004, Science, Innovation and Electronic Information Division, Statistics Canada, Working Paper No. 019.

Bess, J. L. & Dee, Jay, R.D. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice. Volume II – Dynamics of the system.* Sterling Virgina: Stylus.

Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T.E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boonstra. J.J. (2004) Dynamics of organizational change and learning: An introduction. In: J.J. Boonstra (Ed.) *Dynamics of organizational change and learning. Wiley handbooks in the psychology of management in organizations* (pp. 1-42). Chichester: Wiley Publishers.

Borrow, R. (2009). Academic freedom: its nature, extent and value. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 57(2), 178-190.

Brennan, J. King, R., & Lebeau, Y. (2004). The role of universities in the transformation of societies: An international research project synthesis report. London,UK: Association of Commonwealth Universities & Centre for Higher Education Research and Information.

Cameron, K. S. (1984). Organizational adaptation and higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 55*(2), 122-144.

Cochran, A. & Williams, R.(2010). The role of higher education in social and cultural transformation. In *Higher education and society: a research report* (pp.20-26). London, UK. Centre for Higher Education Research and Information.

Cataldi, E.F, Fahimi, M., & Bradburn, E.M. (2005). *2004 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF:04): Report on faculty and instructional staff in fall 2003* (NCES 2005–172). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC:

National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Cross, J. (2010). "They had people called professor...!" Changing worlds of learning: Strengthening informal learning in formal institutions? In U.D. Ehlers & _D. Schneckenberg, (Eds). *Changing cultures in higher education moving ahead to future learning* (pp.43-54)*.* Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Dawson, P.M.B (2003).*Understanding organizational change: The contemporary experience of people at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

De Maret, P. (2004). Charting the course between public service and commercialization: Prices, values and quality. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/TURIN_de_Maret.1086950049382.pdf

Ehlers, U.D. & Schneckenberg, D. (2010). Introduction: Changing cultures in higher education. In U.D. Ehlers & D. Schneckenberg (Eds). *Changing cultures in higher education moving ahead to future learning* (p.1-14)*.* Heidelberg, Germany: Springer.

Fenwick, T. (2005). Gypsy scholars: careful dances outside the research machine. in S. Mojab & W. McQueen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Conference of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education* (pp. 116-121). Toronto, ON: OISE/University of Toronto.

Graham,W. (2000) `Academic freedom or commercial license?' in J.Turk (ed.)*The corporate campus: commercialization and the dangers to Canada's colleges and universities*. Toronto: Canadian Association of University Teachers.

Gupta, A. (2008) In search of new identity: universities in the era of political and economic hegemony. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, *1*(3), 290-301.

Hearn, J.C. (1996)**.** Transforming U.S. higher education: An organizational perspective. *Innovative Higher Education*, *21*(2), 141-154.

Horn, M. (2002). Academic freedom. *Canadian Encyclopedia*. Retrieved from: http://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.com/index.cfm?PgNm=TCE&Params=A1ARTA0000017

Hooker, M. (1997). The transformation of higher education. Retrieved from. http://horizon.unc.edu/projects/seminars/Hooker.asp

(Originally published Hooker, M. (1997). The transformation of higher education. In D. Oblinger & S. C. R. (Eds.) (1997). *The learning revolution*. Bolton, MA: Anker

Kayrooz, C., Kinnear, P., & Preston, P. (2001) Academic freedom and the commercialisation of Australian universities: perceptions and experiences of social scientists. Discussion Paper no. 47, The Australia Institute, Canberra

Kezar, A.J. (2001). Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* Volume 28, Number 4.

Leiser, B.M. (1994) Threats to academic freedom and tenure. *Pace Law Review*, *15*(1). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/plr/vol15/iss1/3

Lin, J. (2006).The teaching profession: Trends from 1999 to 2005. *Education Matters: Insights on Education, Learning and Training in Canada, 3*(4). Retrieved from http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-004-x/2006004/9540-eng.htm

MacDonald, E., & Williams ,G. (2006). *Threats to academic freedom*. Retrieved from http://www.gtcentre.unsw.edu.au/content/2592006-00000

March, J.G. (1994). The evolution of evolution. In J. A.C. Baum & J.V. Singh. *Evolutionary dynamics of organizations,* (p.27- 52).New York: Cambridge University Press

Martin, J., & Frost, P. (1996). The organizational culture war games: A struggle for intellectual dominance. In S.R. Glegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord (Eds.) *Handbook of Organizational Studies* (p. 599-621). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Massy F.W., & Zemsky, R. (1995). *Using information technology to enhance academic productivity*. Retrieved from http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/html/nli0004.html

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization.* Newbury Park, CA.: Sage

Nelson, C. (2009). The fate of academic freedom. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 108*(4), 689-699.

Nelson, C. (2010). *No university is an island: Saving academic freedom.* New York: New York University Press.

Nordvall, R. C. (1982). *The process of change in higher education institutions*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Nutting, M.M. (2003). Part-time faculty: Why should we care? *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2003*(123), 33-39.

Omiecinski, T. (2003). Hiring of part-time university faculty on the increase. *Education Quarterly Review*, (Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 81-003-XPB), *9*(3), 9-14.

Poole, M.S. & Van de Ven, A.H. (2004). Introduction. In M.S. Poole & A. H. Van de Ven (eds.) *Handbook of organizational change and innovation* (p.xi-xii). New York: Oxford University Press.

Poole, M. S., & Van de Ven, A. H (1995). Explaining development and change in organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 510-540.

Purcell, M. (2007)**.** Skilled**,** cheap, and desperate**:** Non**-**tenure-track faculty and the delusion of meritocracy. *Antipode. 39*(1), 121-143.

Rajagopalan, N., & Spreitzer, G. M. (1996). Toward a theory of strategic change: A multi-lens perspective and integrated framework. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 48-79.

Rasmussen, E. (2008). Government instruments to support the commercialization of university research: Lessons from Canada. *Technovation*, *28*(8) 506–517.

Smith, N. (2000) Afterword: who rules this sausage factory? *Antipode*, *32*(3), 330-339.

Soley, L. C. (1995). *Leasing the ivory tower: The corporate takeover of academia.* Boston: South End Press.

Stelfox HT, Chua G, O'Rourke K., & Detsky, A.S. (1998). Conflict of interest in the debate over calcium channel antagonists. *New England Journal of Medicine*, *338*(2), 101-105.

Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Sterckx, S. (2006). *Ethical aspects of the commercialisation of academic research. Research Plan. Bioethic Institute Ghent*. Retrieved from http://www.bioethics.ugent.be/research/sterckx

The American Association for the Advancement of Science (2010). AAAS 2010 Annual meeting news: Dr. Nancy Olivieri, a champion of patient safety, wins AAAS Scientific Freedom and Responsibility Award. Retrieved from

http://news.aaas.org/2010/02172009-science-freedom-award.shtml

The American Association of University Professor (1993). *The status of non-tenure-Track Faculty*. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/ comm/rep/nontenuretrack.htm.

The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (2001). *Commercialization of university research.* Ottawa, ON. AUCC.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers (2005). *Stronger together: One association for all.* Ottawa, ON: CAUT

The New York Times (1916). The professors' union. *New York Times* 21 January 1916: 8. Retrieved from http://www.brocku.ca/MeadProject/NYT/NYT_1916_01_16.html

Tierney, W. G., & Lechuga, V.M (2010). The social significance of academic freedom. *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies, 10*(2), 118-133.

Tillyer, A. (2005). Educational technology and "roads scholars". *Academe*, *91*(4), 49-52.

Townsend, R. & Hauss, M. (2002). The 2002 AHA-OAH survey of part-time and adjunct faculty. *Perspectives, 40*(7), 18-20.

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (1993). Records of the general conference twenty-seventh session: Volume 1. resolutions. Paris, 25 October to 16 November 1993. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Pyschology*, *50*, 361-388.

Woodhouse, H. (2009). *Selling out: Academic freedom and the corporate market*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

World Conference on Higher Education (1998). *World declaration on higher education for the twenty-first century: Vision and action and framework for priority action for change and development in higher education*. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm

İletişim/Communication:
Serdar Erkan
Ph.D. in Psychological Services in Education
Ph.D. candidate in Educational Administration
Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
e-posta: see216@mail.usask.ca