

# Knowledge Management seen from a Reformational Context: Deanship as an Example

*Dr. L. O. K. Lategan*

## Samevatting

*In hierdie artikel word kennisbestuur vanuit 'n reformatoriese perspektief bespreek. Dekaanskap word as voorbeeld gebruik. Die rol van die dekaan word vanuit sewe verskillende perspektiewe bekyk. Hierdie perspektiewe reflekteer die uitdagings en probleme van dekaanskap in die eeu van kennisbestuur. Voorbeelde van die uitdagings en die probleme is die magstryd tussen uitvoerende besture en fakulteite, bestuur en leierskap, bestuurstyle, kliënteverhoudinge, onderrig, navorsing, ens. Die punt word beredeneer dat die dekaan 'n bestuurder van die kennisonderneming moet wees.*

## 1. Introduction

Many challenges are facing the university today. These challenges ranges from government interference in the academic affairs of a university to demands by business/industry for students who are employable to meet the needs of the world of work to management practices that need to keep a university competitive to other providers of higher education to the development of diversity in a university's knowledge basis, student and staff profile. To complicate matters even more, it should be noted that within each of these challenges there are many burning issues that should be resolved. One issue is what kind of management should be practiced in a university where the generation (research), transmission (teaching) and application (service) of knowledge are at the centre of activities.

The focus of this article will be on knowledge management in a university. Knowledge management can be defined as “cultivating a learning culture in which organisational members systematically gather knowledge and share it with others in the organisation so as to achieve better performance” (Robbins *et al.*, 2003:59). Applied to a university context, one can formulate two perspectives:

- Knowledge management is the growth in knowledge how to improve the management of universities as knowledge institutions.
- Knowledge management is an approach to manage knowledge transmission, development and application as the core business of a university.

A Dean's management responsibilities will be taken as case study to contextualise the topic. The viewpoint taken will be from a Reformational framework for knowledge management based on the two interpretations of knowledge management.

## **2. A reformational framework for knowledge management**

Literature on knowledge management seen from a Reformational framework is virtually nonexistent. This article is an attempt to debate knowledge management from this framework (and not the framework itself). A Reformational framework for knowledge management will consist of the following values:

- Man is called to be the keeper of God's world. This includes the effective management of societies, institutions and companies to secure that the world and its resources are not exploited. Sustainability is the password.
- Management should deal with the core activities of an entity. In the case of a university all management should be directed at enhancing the development of knowledge. In addition, the uniqueness of knowledge should be maintained and knowledge should be the guiding principle in all activities of a university. The Reformation has taught us the uniqueness of social entities and that everything in the universe should be treated according to its unique creational features.
- Regardless of what is being managed, management will always have people involved. In managing people all power play are at odds with a Reformational management style. In management people should be respected as human beings created in the image of God, they should be treated as a neighbour and treated with justice. This doesn't mean that employees cannot be disciplined. The requirement here is that whenever an employee is disciplined or corrected for his/her behaviour it must be done in such a manner that no human dignity is lost.
- Values and norms should exist in every management style. In a university context where knowledge lies at the core of all activities, a value- and norm driven management style will have as objective respect and recognition of the uniqueness of a person, his/her personal values,

faith and traditions; protection of dignity; freedom of choice of a person who is competent to take independent decisions; protection and promotion of the welfare of the individual; treat all personal information with confidentiality; every person has a right to privacy; new discoveries should be presented in such a way that the anonymity of the person is protected; researchers will at all times take reasonable precautions to ensure that people participating in experiments will be disadvantaged as little as possible; academic staff will keep strictly to the approved and responsible methods of the experimental procedure; etc.

Against this framework the debate on knowledge management will be looked into seen from the role and expectations of Deanship.

### **3. Problem statement and hypothesis**

“So in a sense, the Dean is caught in the middle between past traditions of academic management and the new push towards executive leadership and entrepreneurship” – Meek (2003: 6)

During a Deans' Conference<sup>1</sup>, N Cloete<sup>2</sup> remarked that Deans are caught between the demands from Executive Management to execute decisions on its behalf and Faculties to present their academic needs to Executive Management and/or to manage the Faculties as business units. Cloete refers to this awkward situation as the “in betweenness of Deanship”. Meek (2003) links up with this, saying that what was expected of Deans in the past doesn't match with the challenges of today. Their positions should be clarified, especially in an environment where there is a growing demand for executive leadership and entrepreneurship (see Meek, 2003).

The hypothesis of the article is that although it is generally expected of Deans that they should be knowledge managers, it is not quite evident in their management practices.

The question therefore is what knowledge management entails?

### **4. Management of the knowledge enterprise**

The question is very often asked as to what Deans should manage. The answer that it is their Faculties that they need to manage, is too general in

---

1 Conference jointly presented by the South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association (SAUVCA) and the Committee for Technikon Principals (CTP), 29-30 April 2002.

2 Dr N Cloete, Director: Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET).

nature. P Naudé<sup>3</sup> argues that Deans have only one management responsibility and that is to manage the knowledge enterprise. His comment is supported by the fact that higher education is increasingly seen as a knowledge enterprise that should contribute towards the knowledge society. From this perspective it is evident that the Dean's management role has the management of knowledge as object and a university as context. In dealing with the object and context a number of issues should be considered. The author mentions the following:

- A university is a knowledge institution – the core of its activities revolves around knowledge. What should be managed in a university is knowledge. Knowledge management should lead to the continuous improvement and development of knowledge.
- Knowledge has become a commodity. The knowledge economy is all about the “buying” and “selling” of knowledge. But, for knowledge to be sold, it needs to be responsive to market, industrial and business needs. No university can ignore developments in the knowledge society but if a university produces knowledge only for the likes of the knowledge economy then it (the university) loses sight of its primary task and that is to generate new knowledge based on scientific discovery.

One can rightfully ask whether Deans have the time and the abilities to manage knowledge development. The validity of this question is to be found in the three assignments of higher education (see paragraph 1). For Deans to manage the knowledge enterprise, they need to interact with and reflect on the following:

- There should be closer links with business and industry to identify the needs of the students' future employers.
- Integrating innovation and entrepreneurship into the curricula.
- Expanding research contracts (spin-in to the institution).
- Commercialisation of research (spin-off from the institution).
- Branding of the curricula.
- Linking the faculty's strategic plan to the local economy and the regional needs.

---

3 Presentation read during a Dean's Conference, Pretoria, 29-30 April 2002.

Setting a vision for the faculty in the context of Mode 2 Knowledge<sup>4</sup>.

Most Deans will agree that their current work situation leaves little if any time for these activities. Instead, their time is consumed by administrative activities and not the management of the Faculties. For Deans to become managers of the knowledge enterprise, they need to make a double mind-shift. *Firstly*, they need to become less operational (administrative) and more managerial. *Secondly*, they need to have a focused management approach, which is the management of the knowledge enterprise.

These values are grossly neglected when knowledge is not at the core of the management practices. The next seven paragraphs will indicate how the most challenging management issues (such as the relationship between Executive Management and the Faculties, managerial needs, styles and approaches, external relationships and professional activity) either complement or decline the notion of knowledge management.

## **5. Application of knowledge management**

### **5.1 Power play**

The remark made by Cloete (paragraph 3) calls for analysis. His “in betweenity” is a clear indication of a power play between a Faculty (as the collection of academic staff) and Executive Management. The power play at work is the Faculty’s academic authority (based on subject knowledge) and Executive Management’s decisions (based on managerial practices, budgetary decisions, institutional policies and procedures). Many examples of such power play exist. In terms of the Higher Education Act (Act 101 of 1997) the Vice Chancellor has the “power” to transform the institution for managerial reasons; he/she can also veto a decision. Although Faculty Boards have no statutory power, they represent the academia within a particular group of programmes. Faculty Boards have no authority to finalise academic policies for their Faculties but need to submit all proposed policies to the Senate for final approval. The irony is that non-academic staff members, who are part of the Senate, are very often responsible for rejecting Faculty Boards’ submissions. This leaves the Dean with very little choice. As the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a Faculty, the Dean is in dire straits: he/she will have very little option but

---

4 Gibbons (1997:21) defines Mode 2 Knowledge as knowledge produced in the context of application, transdisciplinarity, heterogeneity and organized diversity, enhanced social accountability and broadly based systems of quality control.

to execute the decisions of a Faculty. At the same time, the Dean can receive get an instruction from Executive Management which leaves him/her with very little choice but to execute it. The matter is complicated in the cases where the Dean is a member of the Executive Management.

A Dean can use this power play to his/her advantage. As the head of the Faculty, the Dean can use Faculty decisions against the decisions of the Executive Management. The Dean can also use an Executive Management decision to force a Faculty to support him/her if there is not general support for the decision in question. The irony is that the management objective and academic knowledge are used to oppose each other instead of using management to enhance academic objectives.

Although this kind of power play is not new to higher education institutions, it is an indication that Executive Management does not manage knowledge and that Faculties do not always see academia in the broader context of higher education objectives.

## **5.2 Acting as Hermes**

In Greek mythology, Hermes is known as the messenger of the gods. This metaphor could be applicable to the role that Deans play either as part of the Executive Management and/or as heads of their Faculties. Deans are often the bearers of the message, whether from Executive Management or from the Faculties, and, as in the case of Hermes, not all messages are received with equanimity.

Various lessons can be learnt from this metaphor. *Firstly*, Deans can simply act as messenger for the Executive Management and Faculties without impacting on either of these bodies. They deliver the message as it is. The problem with such an approach is obvious: there is no communication between Executive Management and the Faculties regarding their demands/perspectives/expectations. No Dean can be a responsive manager without bringing the Executive Management and Faculties closer to each other. *Secondly*, Deans can impact on the messages to and from the Executive Management and Faculties by putting these messages into either the context of management objectives (the Executive Management) or that of academic objectives (Faculties). Deans have a responsibility to manage their faculties in the broader context of management objectives. Academia is not and should not be isolated from management objectives. *Thirdly*, Deans and Vice-Chancellors have to learn how to take charge and how to let go. Deans can never be indifferent to the communications/decisions from the Executive Management and

Faculties. Deans should voice their views on academic and management matters at an institution. Deans should not allow their fate to be that of the messengers of old: the enemy killed the messenger if they didn't like the message that had been brought to them. Here the Dean is dependent upon the likes and dislikes of the Executive Management and Faculties. Unfortunately, Deans cannot always direct matters their way. An appropriate strategy to avoid a situation where the Dean is caught between the power play of the Executive Management and Faculties is to treat a Faculty as an independent unit within a larger corporation. The challenge is to balance the corporate interest with divisional autonomy. Raynor & Bower (2001:100) state that corporate and division executives should have frequent conversations that are not cluttered with operational issues. This calls for a mature management style from the Executive Management's side. To facilitate this, they identify four management tactics.

- Combine strict financial controls with a flexible structure.
- Be a player in the context that you are operating.
- Have a lean but powerful corporate office.
- Spend time on strategy.

These tactics are taking the focus away from the operational issues and placing the emphasis on the strategy of the corporation (read university). The benefit of this approach is twofold. *Firstly*, it emphasises the need for a corporate strategy that will include and accommodate the needs of the divisions. *Secondly*, these tactics emphasise strategy and not operations. The latter is one of the most important reasons why Deans and the Executive Management cannot meet eye to eye. Executive Management very often interferes with the operations of a Faculty. This leads to confrontation between the needs of the Faculties on the ground and the idealistic needs of the institution. The situation will continue to occur, where there is not a shared strategy to address the needs.

### **5.3 Manager and leader**

Modern management is characterised by setting objectives, organising activities, motivating and communicating with people, measuring by establishing yardsticks and developing people (Beatty, 1998:110). A manager's task is to make the strengths of people effective and their weaknesses irrelevant (Beatty, 1998:116). In a time of a changing work environment, this has become even more important. Change management is there not only to direct the enterprise/business into a new direction but also to have employees who can meet the set objectives. Within this context, Peter Drucker (2002) argues that employers are not dealing with

employees but with people. This is becoming more and more of an issue due to the fact that many employees are no longer the traditional employees of a business and many businesses have outsourced their Human Resource Relations (HRR) and have therefore a limited relationship with the people who are their formal employees.

Effective employee relationships require both managers and leaders. The leader should be able to define a vision, mission and core values for the changed institution and to take staff along while the manager should be able to have the skills to implement the vision, mission and core values and to enable others to meet these objectives.

This dual combination of managerial and leadership skills is effectively portrayed in several (international) paperback books on this topic. In *Who moved my cheese?* (Johnson, 1998) the reader will find that too many people deny the fact that the world around them is changing. They deny the fact that change can lead to something good. People are not ready to participate in a changing world due to fear of the unknown. It is for this reason that they are not prepared to take on a new challenge. What the author is emphasising, is the need to move on as the world is moving on. This calls for a change in the person and his/her attitude in a situation.

The idea of a changing attitude is complemented by *What they don't teach you at Harvard Business School* (McCormack, 1994). In this book it is stated that for people to survive modern business they need more than only a good sense for business. They need a personality that is appealing to people. An appealing personality is much more than a psychology that people will like. It is all about a person who can fit into a situation and can encourage other people to have trust in your abilities as a manager and a leader.

This theme is repeated in *The mind of a fox* (Sunter & Ilbury, 2001). The authors underline the need for people who are not limited to the new working environment because they cannot adapt themselves. A stable working environment is satisfied with the employees who give stability to this environment because of their unchanging character (they use the metaphor of a hedgehog). What is now needed, are people who can adapt as the world is changing. These people don't think along the lines of long term strategies but they position themselves in what is now needed in a given situation (the metaphor of the fox).

The book "*The art of creating windmills*" (Hawkins, 1999) encourages one to adapt to a new situation. The point of departure in this book is that as new kinds of companies arise, new patterns of work evolve. In addition,



the global market and ever-developing technology require a new kind of employee. Hawkins (1999) identifies seven tactics to assist the employee in meeting the demands of the world of work. The message Hawkins is conveying is clear: you can build a wall and isolate yourself from the changing world. Or you can build windmills and direct the changing society your way.

These perspectives might coincide with Heraclitus' idea of everything is in a continuous process of change (*panta rei*). Modern society will conform to this philosophy. But what shouldn't be forgotten is that in all change (*continuity*) the basis of what must be changed should be re-found (*constancy*). The lesson to be learnt is that whilst change is unavoidable, no change can go without a basis for change. Without understanding this, managers will perceive change as normal within an abnormal situation. Any kind of change will then be legitimised as necessary to manage the situation.

What is clear from these perspectives is that the Dean as the head of a Faculty must be a manager and a leader. He/she should be able to analyse the changing environment and to assist his/her Faculty members to adapt to a new environment. There is no way that the Dean can fulfil only one of the roles. The fact that a Dean is often not able to be a manager and a leader at the same time, is the main reason why a Dean is not able to execute management objectives and academic needs. The best test for this is the question on the vision of an institution. Can the Dean clearly articulate a vision for his/her Faculty? Can the Dean take his/her Faculty members along to meet the vision for the Faculty? Can the Dean communicate the Faculty's vision to the university and its communities (business, industry and social communities)?

In dealing with this situation, one may learn from Kulati & Moja's (2002) concept called *transformational leadership*. They define it as a combination of recognised leadership elements with co-operative governance. Managing and leading a division/institution are not an intellectual activity. Unfortunately, in academia management and leadership are often understood as intellectual activities. It is for this reason that I favour their concept. This concept, which is derived from two case studies in South African universities, involves a hands-on approach to management and leadership. This is evident through the elements of this approach such as negotiation, trust, consultation, role differentiation and forums.

It should be evident that a Dean cannot escape the dual function of being a manager and an academic leader simultaneously. For Deans to be able to

take on this role they need to have “Level 5 Leadership” skills. Collins (2001) describes this as an executive in whom extreme personal humility blends paradoxically with intense professional will. This leadership style opposes the “chainsaw” approach – an egocentric chief to lead the corporation. A “level 5 leader” is portrayed by humility, will, ferocious resolve and the tendency to give credit to others while assigning blame to themselves. Without this kind of managerial and leadership style chances are very small that the Dean will be able to be a peer to his Faculty members (the notion of will) and a scholar to the university community (humility)!

#### **5.4 Management by confetti**

A management style that causes concern is management through papers/documents/instructions. I would like to refer to this distorted management style as *management by confetti*. Many Vice-Chancellors believe that policies and procedures will manage their institutions. Their excuse for this management style is that “government requires accountability”. The point is well taken that an institution needs documents to reflect their accountability. However, evidence for accountability and the management of accountability issues are not the same. What tends to be forgotten is that people manage and not documents. Documents are only instruments through which people can manage. After all, management deals with handling issues and decision-making.

Management by confetti keeps people busy all the time. Deans very often spend their time signing forms (in triplicate) and drafting reports for various committees. The moral dilemma with this is that people are busy but not productive. In addition, they are busy with issues not concerning them but another unit. Badaracco’s (1998) case study “Kathryn McNeil” has an element of this in it. Although the case study is presented to illustrate unethical work relations, it has an undertone suggesting the mismanagement of time. Employees at a computer company have to submit stacks and stacks of reports on their daily activities. One line is disturbing:

He normally arrived home when his children were already asleep and left before they awoke. At night, he barely had enough energy to speak to his wife before he faded off to sleep, exhausted from a day of wading through stacks of reports (Badaracco, 1998:239).

This quote reflects the results of management by confetti.

Another concern that should be mentioned is that Deans are not postmasters. Faculty members often complain that Deans receive

instructions from the Executive Management and then simply pass them on to them. In return, all requests/decisions from Faculties are sent back to the Executive Management without the Dean's perspective or comments added. Management implies the active involvement of Deans with faculty and university issues.

### **5.5 Management by consensus**

The impression could be created that Deans are “puppets” and not managers in own right. This is a concern especially in a context into which many institutions are now moving in adopting a management model where Deans will be known as Executive Deans. The intention of this model is that Deans should be the CEOs of their Faculties and should take final management and budgetary decisions within the framework of the institutional strategic plan and policies. The rationale behind this model is that Faculties should be management units and should be more entrepreneurial in approach.

What should be reflected here is that it is not the management model, that will ease the management responsibilities of the Deans, but a management style, which will accommodate a variety of management styles and objectives. This model, generally known as management by consensus, has the advantage that all people support the decision and that decisions are not made only on the basis of the democracy vote. Such an approach will avoid the power play between the Executive Management and Faculties, preventing Deans from being caught between these bodies and allowing Deans to have an input into the decision-making process. What should also be appreciated in this model is that Deans will be secured of a reflective role in the management of the institution.

In an environment where this is the tone of leadership, humility and will together contribute to a new management philosophy, once again placing the emphasis on measuring the outcomes instead of the process.

### **5.6 Customer-relations manager**

Higher education requires an aggressive customer relations approach. It is said more and more that universities have to deal with a variety of customers ranging from the student (direct beneficiary of the educational product), government (as funding agency), business and industry (as end-users of the educational product) and social communities (as beneficiaries of applied higher education) (Lategan, 2002). The point that should be taken from this new philosophy is that Deans need to take care of

customer-relations in as well as beyond their Faculties. Within the context of Faculties, this means that Deans have their Faculty members as well as the institutional academic support services as their customers. The latter addition is supported by Hawkins (1999:34) who states that one should treat others as customers and see yourself as a customer as well.

There should be no doubt that customer-relations are growing in importance in higher education institutions. Kotler & Fox (1995:23) are right when they say that understanding the lecturer/student relationship only in the customer paradigm is to limit this relationship. However, the needs and expectations of the students – and therefore the customers – of the academic enterprise cannot be ignored. People are looking for a strong return on educational investment (Kotler & Fox, 1995:43). South African higher education – as other international systems – has not escaped the trend according to which students prefer certain institutions to others simply because of the reputation of the institutions and the quality of the academic programmes. In addition, the latest South African higher education policy documents recognise the competition between institutions (university versus university) and between systems (university versus technikon). It is therefore notable that many higher education institutions have improved their public image by improving their strategic position in the market.

The lesson that Deans should learn is the undebateable situation that staff and students are no longer only colleagues and learners but are the customers of the educational enterprise – a growing concept within the context of higher education. What should be accomplished here is that the customers should be able to express their needs although not their demands. Students cannot demand the contents of the curriculum but they can express their views on the quality of the education. Deans should manage the needs side of the customers' expectations and not the demand side. This is something that does not belong within the context of higher education and should be ignored from a Faculty's point of view. The needs expressed by the customers (staff and students) are imported to mainstream the quality of the education, which includes the tuition, the research, the curricula, etc. As managers of Faculties, Deans should contribute towards the branding of their Faculties' product (read curricula and research). In this context Mentasti (2002) says that the branding of the institutions does not always meet the needs and expectations of the students or business and industry. This explains why so many institutions are not able to position themselves within a particular market segment. This assignment becomes essential for Deans in the light of the tough

competition amongst institutions to recruit the best SET students, students that are not under-prepared and equal opportunity students. What could be helpful in this situation, is the so-called *brand portfolio molecule*. Leiderer & Hill (2001) introduce this concept to accommodate all the brands that factor into a consumer's decision to buy, whether or not the company owns them. This is an improvement on the *branding portfolio*, which includes only those brands owned by the company. The advantage of Leiderer & Hill's concept is that the Dean will understand that more than just institutional factors impact on the recruitment strategy of an institution. Here issues such as safety of the environment, job opportunities within the region, links with businesses and industries, community services, etc. are at stake.

### **5.7 Educator and researcher**

C Kirkpatrick, Dean of Parks College for Engineering at St Louis University, USA, remarks that a Dean is a faculty member who teaches a little less. The importance of this remark is that the Dean cannot afford to lose contact with the teaching side of academia. At many universities around the world, there are sufficient examples of Deans involved in teaching and research. From my visits to some of these universities the following reasons are given for Deans' continuous involvement in teaching and/or research:

- When their term as Dean ends, they want to return to the classroom and the laboratory.
- Their professional careers require continuous academic commitment.
- They cannot expect their faculty members to be effective educators and researchers if they are not themselves involved with teaching and research.
- They need to set the example for faculty members.
- It is an opportunity to be in contact with students and their needs.

These reasons are all remarkable and supported. But, if Deans are to be engaged in teaching and research, care needs to be taken of two issues: *firstly*, Deans should have free time to be active in teaching and/or research. It will not serve the purpose if the Deans are doing it as a side-activity and not really setting an example for their faculty members or contributing significantly in their fields of study. *Secondly*, Deans should take care that their teaching/researching activities never compete with their responsibilities as the manager of a Faculty. A Dean's main objective is to manage a Faculty and not to teach. However, for professional reasons and in a time where the position of a Dean has become a term contract (as

opposed to a full-time appointment) teaching and research should be considered in the work plans of the Dean.

### **5.8 Observation**

In this article the role of the Deans has been discussed from eight different angles. The point argued throughout the paper is that Deans should be managers of the knowledge enterprise. Deans should act as managers of their Faculties and be less operational. Unless Deans break with the traditional approach to Deanship, Faculties will never have the opportunity to develop into management units, to be independent as regards the core business of a Faculty and to attend only to the core business of their faculties.

## **6. Discussion**

From this article it is evident that the Dean is not always acting as a knowledge manager. Many reasons can be given for this. I mention the following five reasons:

- A management style directed at regulating people instead of empowering them to be actively involved with the core activities of a university.
- Operational matters require Deans to spend time on issues that are not supportive of knowledge management.
- A common belief that people should be kept busy all the time instead of directing their time to a specific task and the completion thereof.
- Deans are not always familiar with management, they lack managerial skills and they confuse administration with management and leadership.
- A distracted focus on what university management, and therefore, knowledge management is all about.

A Reformational management framework also critiques the lack of knowledge management at universities as well as the management styles described above. A Reformational management framework will advocate that the core of a structure/entity should be managed. The unique sovereignty of a life form should be managed. If not, then a life form is not respected for its unique features and any development would not enhance the characteristics of a particular life form.

Following on the value of unique sovereignty, is people management. No reformational management framework will have piece with a situation where people are ill treated. Regulation is necessary, but regulation at the

expense of people's humanity is unacceptable. People should feel that they are working in an environment where regulation follows on work security, development, empowerment, opportunities to correct mistakes, etc. and not these values following on regulation. It is a shame if managers see themselves only as "messengers" and "post offices." It is intolerable that managers/employees are caught in a power play. After all, the most important value of any company (read university) is its people and what they can do for the company (read university). In the case of the university, Deans can play an enormous role in acquiring more knowledge to manage the university successfully as well as how to manage knowledge transmission, knowledge development and knowledge application as core university activity!

## 7. Conclusion

In a changing university environment, knowledge management is necessary to secure that a university remains a university despite the fact that its core activities (teaching and research) might take on new delivery modes. In securing this, Deans are essential in the management of the university – through acquiring knowledge that will lead to the improvement of the university and the transmission/development/application of knowledge. Since Deans are mostly managing people and their activities a Reformational management framework can be useful in two ways: it secures the unique features of the university as an academic institution and it maintains basic human values. The latter is important in an age where external forces to the university can become more important than the people working at the university. Should the latter happen, then the employees are subjected to external forces such as the politics, economy, technology, etc. which in itself as contradicting to Reformational values.

## Bibliography

- BADARACCO, J.L. 1998. *Business ethics: Roles and responsibilities*. St Louis: McGraw-Hill.
- BEATTY, J. 1998. *The world according to Drucker*. London: Orion Books.
- COLLINS, J. 2001. Level 5 Leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review*. January. 66-76.
- DRUCKER, P. 2002. They're not employees, they are people. *Harvard Business Review*. February. 70-77.
- GIBBONS, M. 1997. Factors affecting the balance between teaching and research in the universities of the twenty-first century. *Higher Education in Europe*. Xxii (1): 21-30.
- HAWKINS, P. 1999. *The art of building windmills*. Liverpool: Graduate into Employment Unit.

- JOHNSON, S. 1998. *Who moved my cheese?* London: Vermilion.
- KULATI, T. & MOJA, T. 2002. Leadership. In Cloete, N. *et al.* (Eds). *Transformation in Higher Education. Global pressures and local realities in South Africa*. Landsdowne: Juta. 230-265.
- LEIDERER, C. & HILL, S. 2001. See your brands through your customers' eye. *Harvard Business Review*. June. 125-133.
- MCCORMACK, M. 1994. *What they don't teach you at Harvard Business School*. London: Harper Collins Business.
- MEEK, L. sa The changing nature of the Deanship. *Cheps unplugged*. 3 (1): 6
- MENTASTI, A. Branding, innovation and entrepreneurship. Paper read at a *Summit on Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. 11-13 June 2002, Bloemfontein Technikon Free State.
- RAYNOR, M.E. & BOWER, J.L. 2001. Lead from the Centre: How to manage divisions dynamically. *Harvard Business Review*. May. 80-91.
- ROBBINS, S.P., BERGMAN, R., STAGG, I. & COULTER, M. 2003. *Foundations of management*. Frenchs Forests: Prentice Hall.
- SUNTER, C. & ILLBURY, C. 2001. *The mind of a fox*. Cape Town: Human & Rousseau / Tafelberg.