An interpretation of the competing values framework in PNG's multicultural higher education landscape

Maretta Alup Kula-Semos

Abstract

This paper summarises and critiques the competing values framework a business management model, proposed by Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, McGrath and St Clair (2007) and reconceptualised by Sharrock (2012) to guide university leaders and managers. University leaders and managers are largely engaged in managing knowledge and knowledge workers within a knowledge economy, so whilst drawing from models of global management systems is helpful for purposes of benchmarking, in PNG, there are multiple contextual and conceptual challenges. Institutions of higher education operate within diverse and challenging socioeconomic, sociocultural, geographical and environmental contexts, alongside the existence of indigenous knowledges, as expressed in the linguistic and cultural diversity. These diversities and contextual challenges have wider implications for public policy and practice for the management of knowledge. I present an interpretation of the competing values framework in a multicultural PNG higher education landscape through the lens of indigenous knowledges which exist alongside Western knowledge systems. The experiences of Divine Word University, is largely drawn upon to illustrate how the various CVF models can be applied by university leaders and managers in PNG.

Keywords: higher education, competing values framework, management model, knowledge management, knowledge workers, knowledge economy, indigenous knowledges, worldviews, policy borrowing

Introduction

Higher education institutions, like all other organisations, are constantly changing to prepare themselves better to cope with the challenges of an ever-changing socioeconomic and political context shaped by a knowledge economy. Within this context, government policies can change drastically influencing the purpose of higher education, as encapsulated in some university mission statements in developed nations. In addition, the advancement of information communication technology is bound to change the nature of research, teaching and learning, and service engagement, as universities are expected to diversify their course offerings and engage more in the delivery of professional qualifications to meet market demands. Consequently, delivering high quality education will be an issue to contend with, given the need to meet the demands of 'mass participation and growing diversity in tertiary study, the growth of disciplinary knowledge, the emergence of a more integrated global economy and the challenges this poses for nations, governments and institutions' (extracted from summary of MGMT90113 course material - Part A).

In a 2008 report of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), higher education institutions are urged to be flexible, innovative, and be willing and open-minded to change, given the significant role they play in creating, disseminating and managing knowledge. As Meek and Davis (2009) rightly point out, higher education institutions are in the business of managing knowledge systems and knowledge workers. Thus, 'in developing and developed countries alike, the utility of higher education governance and management models will be judged in terms of how well they allow the higher education institutions to contribute to further the knowledge society and knowledge economy' (Meek & Davis, 2009:8).

Along these lines, the competing values framework as proposed by Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, McGrath and St Clair (2007) and contextualized to suit universities and higher education institutions by Sharrock (2012), is presented as an integrated management model to discuss managing knowledge systems and knowledge workers. Drawing from the integrated 'Quinn et al. – Sharrock model', I present an interpretation of the competing values framework in a multicultural PNG higher education landscape. It is necessary to point out that whilst drawing from models of global management systems is helpful for purposes of benchmarking, one must do so with caution and not lose sight of the reality of the socioeconomic, sociocultural, the geographical and environmental contexts, and their implications for political decisions, in which higher education institutions in PNG operate.

To illustrate some of these key contentious issues, I draw largely from the experiences of PNG and in particular, the Divine Word University (DWU), a public university that is privately administered. Given that DWU currently operates in a highly contested policy terrain, a discussion on the PNG higher education context precedes the section on the significance of indigenous knowledges or worldviews and Western worldview. This is done purposely to establish the context for an interpretation of the competing values framework in a multicultural PNG higher education landscape.

The Papua New Guinea higher education context

In PNG, despite public policy influences to reform and restructure universities, institutions of higher education continue to maintain their traditional mission statements, adopted and transplanted from abroad. This is expected given that higher education institutions in developing countries are crafted on Western university models that share the triple mission of teaching, research and community engagement. Policy borrowing from global contexts continues to shape the latest developments in higher education, including the need to now engage in a mixed economy as discussed by Santiago, Trenblay, Basri, and Arnal (2008). The mixed economy appears to suit PNG, given that a key government goal is to ensure that education, including higher education, is accessible to the masses, as long as policies and mechanisms are adapted to suit the PNG context. This view is being offered in light of the multiple contestations that already exist from within and continue to impact on the delivery and particularly, the management of higher education.

The challenges in PNG are worth highlighting to establish the socioeconomic context within which higher education institutions in PNG operate. PNG has more than 867 different languages (Nekitel, 2000), thousands of cultures, strong oral-based traditions, low levels of literacy in English, universal basic education yet to be fully achieved throughout the country, the majority of the people, 85.2% of the total population (Rannells & Matatier, 2005), scattered throughout the country, largely in remote areas, and challenges of poor infrastructure leading to inadequate provision of basic social services. The provision of quality higher education can be seen to be hindered by these factors. Given these barriers, it is almost a misdeed to be discussing emerging market demands influenced by neoliberal policies for the majority of Papua New Guineans when only a few benefit from the higher education sector. When discussing higher education in PNG, it is assumed that most likely, approximately ten per cent of the nation's population and/or citizenship are being discussed as the beneficiaries of higher education in PNG.

Whereas diversity has been discussed widely as a global phenomenon, diversity in PNG is both internally embedded, through culture, and externally imported, initially, through Westernisation and lately, through globalization. Diversity is a lived experience in PNG, unlike elsewhere, as discussed in the literature. In light of these complexities, the provision of higher education in PNG may be viewed as serving a minority of Papua New Guineans, those who can afford to, and those who are fortunate to have gained access to higher education. For this reason, on the one hand, adopting the mixed economy, as postulated by Santiago, et al. (2008) would assist the majority of Papua New Guineas to gain access to higher education, but to expect, that at the same time, the sector would be better placed to drive the agenda of managing knowledge and knowledge workers, may need careful consideration.

With histories of failed reforms and restructures, it is good to be guarded. For instance, models of organisational management have only emerged in recent years and will need to be reconceptualised to suit the PNG context. Consequently, organisational behaviour, drawn from the field of business management theory and practice, remains idealistic for state universities in PNG. Policy borrowing without critically exploring our internal challenges, can lead to creating new challenges hence the race in search for an appropriate model.

In order to appreciate the PNG higher education context, what follows is a discussion on Western worldviews and indigenous worldviews, the domains within which knowledge is created and managed. The discussion provides the context for what follows as an interpretation of the integrated 'Quinn, et al. – Sharrock' competing values framework model.

Indigenous worldviews and Western worldview

Indigenous knowledges not only refer to ecological knowledge, more so, reference is made to the theorizing, creation, sharing and most importantly, the management of knowledges, through indigenous worldviews or ways of knowing. It is within this context that I discuss indigenous worldviews, which are rooted in indigenous philosophy.

In PNG and generally Melanesia, Martin (1991) claims that in indigenous philosophy 'the universe is seen as an interconnected and dynamic living world in which the earth world, together with the sky and spirit worlds and all other life forms are one'. This cosmic vision of reality is also discussed as 'the Melanesian way' by Narokobi (1980). Likewise, Thaman (2006:176) uses the term 'indigenous knowledge systems' to refer to 'specific systems of values, knowledge, understandings and practices developed and accumulated over millennia, by a group of people in a particular region, which may be unique to that group or region'. Given the diversity of languages and cultures in PNG, 'indigenous knowledge systems', is used interchangeably with 'indigenous knowledges', signifying the diversity of ways of knowing or knowledges that exist within the various ethnic and language speaking communities. It is this knowledge that shapes indigenous mindsets and worldviews.

In contrast, the Western knowledge system is embedded in Western philosophy, which views the physical, material world as separate from the spiritual world. Although both Western knowledge system and indigenous knowledge systems differ in philosophy, there is merit in both systems as far as knowledge creation and management are concerned. As Meek & Davis (2009:39) affirm,

> Indigenous knowledge systems and Western knowledge systems are different but have equally valid ways of knowing and interpreting the world. Western knowledge claims universality, while indigenous knowledge is peculiar to the culture that owns it.

Fundamentally, indigenous knowledge systems are holistic and are managed by the users of the knowledge (Ma Rhea, 2004). Kula-Semos (2009) makes reference to earlier advocates (e.g., Battiste, 1995; Semali, 1999; Tuhiwai-Smith, 1999) who argued for a repositioning of indigenous knowledges. Numerous authors like Nakata (2000 & 2007), Thaman (2000; 2003; 2006) and Mel (2000) have also demonstrated the lack of recognition of indigenous knowledges in the academy and the need to promote indigenous methodologies to guide research, and teaching and learning in universities. Gaining insight as to what leaders and managers in PNG institutions of higher education understand their roles and responsibilities to be is necessary for change to be implemented as intended. The assumption that indigenous knowledges can only gain legitimacy by conforming to the theory and practice of Western knowledge and science is therefore challenged (Kula-Semos, 2009) in the context of applying the competing values framework.

The competing values framework: A blend of Quinn, et al. and Sharrock

Quinn, et al. (2007) trace the historical development of management theories that have shaped organizational behaviour and leads to Quinn's 1998 competing values framework to cater for shifting management practices. They point out, that 'in a world of volatility, complexity and ambiguity… the competing values framework …is a time tested, powerful tool that can assist managers as they grapple with these issues' (Quinn, et al., 2007, p, 13). The four management models of *human relations*, *open systems*, *rational goal*, and *internal process* (summarized in tables 1, 3, 5 & 7) if adopted separately, can be seen to be at odds with each other. As such, each will not be able to sustain the demands of a changing organization. The authors therefore present an integrated competing values framework model showing eight general orientations to illustrate the need to adopt inclusive practices in management and to view opposing models as capable of blending and enhancing each other. A manager who is able to integrate the four models of *human relations*, *open systems*, *rational goal* and *internal process* by engaging in the proposed eight orientations is deemed to be a master manager according to Quinn, et al. (2007).

Drawing from Quinn et al., Sharrock (2012) adapts the competing values framework to suit universities and institutions of higher education, which he labels as 'four archetypes of good management for academic enterprises' (p, 10). According to Sharrock, the four models (summarized in tables 2, 4, 6 & 8) can be referred to as: *a professional community*, *creative engagement, system enterprise*, and *a sustainable enterprise*. Sharrock however does not share the views of Quinn, et al. that one can become a master manager by engaging in all four models of the competing values framework. Sharrock argues that the framework, 'is not a set of individual competencies that managers must follow, nor is it a universal set of best practices for all to follow' (2012:10). Instead, a wise managerial leader is one who persistently asks questions, reflects upon and uses the experience to plan for the future. Within this context, I now present a summary of the integrated 'Quinn, et al. – Sharrock' CVF and an interpretation of its application for the PNG higher education context.

The human relations model

According to Quin, et al. (2007), *the human relations model* stresses human development or clan culture and the key priority is **to collaborate**. Those who take on leadership and management roles are expected to facilitate teamwork and mentor members of the team so that participation is maximised and members empowered to take on additional responsibilities as members of an organisation. Such a culture helps build social relationships within an organisational culture.

Table 1: Features of the human relations model (generally in organizations)

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
Human Development • Stresses group cohesion, morale, and human development • Teamwork, participation, empowerment and concern for individuals are highlighted here • The organisational culture can be described as a 'clan' culture.	Facilitator • Foster collective effort • Build cohesion and teamwork • Manage conflict	Mentor • Expected to be open and approachable • Engage in the development of subordinates through a caring and empathic orientation

A professional community

Sharrock on the other hand, refers to his proposed priority zone as *a professional community* where people and culture rule. The key priority is to **be collegial**, as experienced in academic institutions and cultures. Sharrock also maintains that for higher education institutions, a combination of *programs*, *people*, *systems* and *strategy* will equally contribute to the institutions' academic mission. Such an undertaking is critical for change and change management (Sharrock, 2012). Whilst the focus is also on people and organizational culture, a professional community emphasizes the spirit of collegiality, as opposed to that of collaboration, as advocated in Quinn's human relations model.

Table 2: Features of a professional community model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
• Shared aims, values and expertise • Working with high levels of commitment, trust and group affinity • Zone leaders and managers must focus on the needs, concerns and interests (personal and professional) of their academic and administrative colleagues	• Be inclusive and caring • Develop individuals • Keep groups informed, involved, and in tune	• To lead and manage BE COLLEGIAL

Human relations and professional community models: The PNG context

In PNG and Melanesia, the concept of human relations and human development is often understood through the lived experiences of social interaction in communities (Kula-Semos, 2009). Communal norms dictate how people relate to each other within clans and tribes. The focus is on social reciprocity and the need to foster collective effort in the spirit of community. This cultural practice is sometimes viewed as a contributing factor to tensions that exist in a modern university context. Communal value systems often get transferred directly to shape working relations, which is often frowned upon as 'nepotism', when a manager reciprocates goodwill or kind gesture to a fellow Papua New Guinean in a subordinate position. The practice does pose challenges for Papua New Guinean academics and managers, who find themselves in positions of 'conflict of interest' and are unable to separate their private space from the public domain. Culturally, private and public spaces are inseparable, as espoused earlier in the section on indigenous philosophy and worldviews. Whereas, in Western culture which shapes knowledge management in higher education, there is clearly a distinction between the private and public domains.

At Divine Word University, the human relations and professional communities' models are evidently demonstrated wherein group cohesion and issues of social responsibility are emphasized amongst staff, students and the wider community. The university prides itself on developing individuals and within a holistic education context. The Faculty of Arts of Social Sciences, for example, has mentorship systems in place for both staff and students. Senior staff, including, the dean and heads of departments mentor junior staff within an empathic framework, promoting management models of both the human relations and professional community. Whilst the focus is to build a culture of collaborative learning, there is also greater emphasis on building collegiality amongst colleagues, which helps to establish a professional community, as postulated by Sharrock (2012). One could therefore claim that the human relations model and the notion of a professional community can easily be applied in management practices in PNG's higher education institutions.

The open systems model

According to Quinn, et al. (2012), *the open systems model* stresses adaptation, flexibility and innovation, and the key priority is **to create**. The model thrives on adhocracy whereby ad hoc decisions depend on external influences. This model would be fitting for the proposed higher education 'mixed economy' (Santiago, et al., 2008) shaped by market demands and a knowledge economy.

Table 3: Features of the open systems model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
Innovative Adhocracy Culture • Emphasises flexibility, growth, resource acquisition and external support • The 'adhocracy' is the organisational culture that fits this model • Innovation and creativity are important here	Innovator • Brings adaption and change • Absorbs uncertainty by monitoring information in the external environment • Is creative and envisions and conceptualizes the changes needed	Broker • Maintenance of external legitimacy • Liaisons and the control of resources

The creative engagement model

Sharrock (2012) discusses *the creative engagement* zone as one that promotes initiative and is very much dependent on external collaboration. Those who engage in this model are expected to foster new ideas, stay networked and credible, and do good deeds. The focus is to **be engaged** whilst addressing stakeholder demands to benefit the public.

Table 4: Features of the creative engagement model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
• Pursuing learning, discovery and innovation • Involved in outreach and activism • Seeking external partners to support creative projects • Zone *public benefit* rules	Managers must ensure that • Groups and individuals are well set up to pursue academic projects • Often self-selected • At the front line of teaching, research and third stream work • These are often developed in partnership with third parties in other parts of the institution, or outside it	• To lead and manage BE ENGAGED • **Promote** initiative, external collaboration and innovation • Win support for new programs

Open systems and creative engagement: The PNG context

In PNG and Melanesia, respect for elders and systems of hierarchy are culturally rooted. Generally, PNG cultures do not allow for much debate and criticism of leaders. Cultural norms forbid public criticism of someone in

position of authority by an individual member of the community. Only representatives appointed by the community can speak out on behalf of the community. This practice is extended to include limitations by individuals and individual organisations to negotiate outside and across cultural, clan and tribal boundaries. Uncertainty is not tolerated in cultures whereby people expect to be told and demand some form of guarantee to secure long term relations and partnerships. Thus, the open systems poses mindset challenges from indigenous standpoints or worldviews.

Along similar veins, most Papua New Guineans claim to be good Christians, an introduced Western religion that has occupied a significant equal place to traditional religions in the Constitution of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea (PNG Constitution Review Committee, 1975). Fear of God is inherently rooted in the mindsets of those proclaim to be good Christians. Much like in the human relations model whereby the private and public space are inseparable, in PNG, the separation of State politics and the Church, as in Christian churches, is proving to be quite a hurdle to overcome. Such a positioning makes it difficult for managers in state universities to openly adopt the open systems model.

Further to that, PNG institutions of higher learning, especially, state universities, are governed by Government Statutes, and By-Laws. By-Laws establish the terms of reference that guide university committee systems. These hierarchically structured top-down systems are deeply entrenched in bureaucratic 'passing the buck' and 'delay tactics', that prolonged decisions can have implications for advancing knowledge creation and management. State universities mostly depend on government funding so the option of exploring an alternative model like the *open systems*, may prove to be difficult. Until such time state universities in PNG adopt a more liberal approach to also embracing the corporate governance system, both the *open systems model* by Quinn, et al. (2007) and Sharrock's (2012) *creative engagement* zones may be seen to be idealistic to achieve.

Moreover, issues of financial limitations and lack of management knowledge, skills and dispositions will always surpass creative innovations and change, as has been the experience thus far.

By contrast, DWU embraces both the corporate governance system as well as university academic culture of committee systems. The university is open to change and has good relations with the public, private, industry, churches, donors, and national and international nongovernment organisations. In recent years, the university has responded positively to the labour market demands to mount professional masters programs in the Faculty of Business and Informatics. Masters degrees have been developed in business administration, professional accounting and public administration, the latter in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. It is therefore safe to assume that DWU is actively engaging in external collaboration and innovation through the development of new programs.

The rational goal model

Quinn, et al. (2007), describe *the rational goal model* as task oriented and goal driven, with emphasis on planning, goal setting, productivity and clarity. The key priority is **to compete**, as institutions respond to the competitive market culture. *The rational goal model* promotes the culture of enterprise embedded in strategic thinking and planning.

Table 5: Features of the rational goal model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
Competitive Market Culture • Stresses planning, goal setting, productivity and efficiency • This work culture highlights 'market' values • Task orientation, goal clarity, and performance are key aspects here.	Director • Engaged in planning and goal setting • Sets objectives and establishes clear expectations	Producer • Task oriented and work-focused • Motivates members to increase production • Accomplish stated goals

A sustainable enterprise

A *sustainable enterprise model* focuses on the needs, concerns and interests of the enterprise itself. In the context of this discussion, the enterprise is the university or the higher education institution. According to Sharrock, people are seen collectively as human resources – a corporate asset, and also a corporate cost (2012). Hence, the key priority for this model to succeed is to **be strategic** within a context of risk taking and being able to make good use of opportunities as they present themselves.

Table 6: Features of a sustainable enterprise model

Culture	Leadership and Management Roles	
• Attuned to trends in external market conditions and government policy and funding settings • With well-defined priorities, and an explicit game plan to acquire and invest the resources needed to build the capability to sustain academic programs • Zone *SWOT* rules	• Planning typically requires a 'SWOT' (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis to identify internal strengths and weaknesses, and relate these to external opportunities or threats	To lead and manage BE STRATEGIC – **Establish** • Overall outlook, priorities and responsibilities • Act on risks and opportunities

Rational goal and sustainable enterprise: The PNG context

In state universities in PNG, both the *rational goal m*odel and the *sustainable enterprise model* are relatively new, having originated from the corporate culture. The corporate culture is largely shaped by neoliberal policies of marketisation, privatization and standardization, foreign concepts embedded in economic rationalisation from schools of Western philosophy and thought. As such, when adopted into a higher education context that is yet to engage in *open systems* thinking, as discussed earlier, the challenges are bound to far outweigh hopes for successful adoption, let alone, adaptation.

At DWU, *the rational goal* and *sustainable enterprise models* have had some influence in the way the university approaches and manages its programs. Whilst DWU can claim it is guided by strategic direction, is able to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and likes to be competitive, at the same time, the institution needs to apply caution in ensuring that the quality of its undergraduate programs is not compromised. In its strategic planning document, there is emphasis on the need to 'reach international standards by 2016' (DWU Strategic Plan [rev.edition], 2011), although a clear direction or definition in regards to what the university means by 'international' standards is yet to be established (Post Audit Report, 2014). As alluded to by Santiago, et al. (2008), internationalization can mean many different things depending on the context in which it is used. There are drawbacks to pushing such an agenda to reach international standards by a certain timeframe, as all resources are pooled towards achieving this set target, whilst perhaps, overlooking what may matter most, and that is, the consolidation of the current undergraduate programs to ensure these are of quality (Post Audit Report, 2014).

The internal process model

Quinn, et al. (2007), discuss the *internal process model* as one that focuses on internal systems and structures that are hierarchically organised according to an institution's goals and priorities. The priority is **to control**. Much of this control is exercised through centralized information management and communication systems.

Table 7: Features of the internal process model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
Efficiency Hierarchy Culture Focuses on • Information management and communication, • Stability and control Here the work culture emphasizes 'hierarchy' • Formalisation, routines, predictability and centralisation are of importance	Monitor • Checks on performance • Handles records and collects and distributes information • Sees that rules and standards are met	Coordinator • Maintains structure and schedules • Organises and coordinates staff efforts

System integrity

In the *system integrity* zone, policies and procedures dictate the nature of a manager's roles and responsibilities. Leaders and managers are expected to adhere to the internal mechanisms or systems and structures in place for purposes of tracking and reporting (Sharrock, 2012). The priority goal is to **be systematic** by applying robust systems such as standardized regulating and monitoring mechanisms.

Table 8: Features of a system integrity model

Culture	Leadership and management roles	
Ensuring coherent processes to support • Governance, planning, academic standards, quality assurance, financial probity, efficiency and effectiveness, and reporting • Zone *policy and procedure* rule	Managers focus on • Adhering to internally oriented policies and procedures • Ensuring that different work units are meeting budgets or performance targets • Tracking the progress of internal projects that span different work units • Formally reporting on the results of programs to governance committees and external authorities	To lead and manage: BE SYSTEMATIC. Apply robust systems, policies and standards; track programs and budgets

Internal process and system integrity: The PNG context

In modern PNG, most public institutions, including all universities, would be familiar with both the internal process and system integrity models. The adoption of systems theory to lead and manage organizations and institutions has been around since the introduction of Western knowledge and scientific thinking. Universities in PNG are renowned for developing policies and procedures to guide the nature of their work. Committee systems and line management typically govern decision making processes and the communication of these. Thus, the *internal process* and *system integrity models* would be the more common or easier models to adopt and even adapt in the PNG higher education sector.

At DWU, the *internal process* and *system integrity* robustly operate within a rapidly changing environment driven by the advanced ICT that the University prides itself on. A policy library on the intranet is testament to the numerous policies and regulations the university constantly refers to as its guiding principles. Reporting systems through regular tracking ensure deadlines are met and staff promotions are measured according to outcomes. Internal systems of measuring quality through curriculum reviews and developing new programs to meet the demands of both the public and private sector have been evident in recent years.

Conclusion

In this article, I discussed the competing values framework as proposed by Quinn et al. (2007) and advanced by Sharrock (2012) to suit the university context. The framework is drawn from the practices of business management, with the view to enhancing management practices of university leaders and managers. However, as I argued, the notion of management as drawn from the field of business is relatively a new concept to adopt or even adapt to suit the management of higher education institutions in PNG. This poses the question of whether or PNG should continue depending on borrowed policies to reform and restructure its higher education sector.

Whereas the two private universities are able to draw from the integrated competing values framework as envisaged, particularly by Sharrock (2012), the same cannot be said for the four state universities. Apart from promoting academic models of governance to manage knowledge, the two private universities simultaneously apply the corporate governance system. Generally, at DWU the application of all four models is evident, without any one model dominating, and the university management is able to contextualize aspects of each of the models.

On the contrary, state universities may be reluctant to engage in the *open systems*, *creative engagement*, *rational goal* and *sustainable enterprise models* but would do well in the *human relations* and *professional community models* as well as in the *internal process* and *system integrity models*. The heavy reliance on public policy and funding from the government has seen state

universities caught in a state of dependency and heavy reliance on dated models of governance.

Coupled with this, the notion of indigenous knowledges as ways of knowing and interpreting worldviews, remains on the margins of mainstream knowledge creation, dissemination, and management within the academy or institutions of higher learning, such as universities in PNG. It is assumed that indigenous knowledges can only gain legitimacy through the Western knowledge system, a view that is contested in this paper. Whilst both knowledge systems are equally valid in their interpretations of knowledge, it is in the management of the knowledge systems, that the differences can be found. Whereas indigenous knowledges are holistic, Western knowledge is scientific, technical and highly compartmentalized or packaged according to disciplines. Gaining insight to the philosophy and knowledges that shape the worldviews of a Papua New Guinean leader and manager would be helpful in addressing some of challenges that have been highlighted.

In PNG also, the socioeconomic, sociocultural, geographic and environmental contexts provide internal challenges for institutions of higher education to achieve the goals and purposes for their existence. For all the reasons mentioned here, the proposed integrated competing values frameworks remain idealistic from the perspective of a leader and manager in a multicultural PNG higher education landscape, whereby the majority of the universities are state entities.

References

Divine Word University. (2011). *Divine Word University strategic plan: The second decade* (rev. version). Madang: DWU.

Kula-Semos, M. (2009). *Seeking transformative partnerships: schools, university and the practicum in Papua New Guinea.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, James Cook University, Townsville.

Ma Rhea, Z. (2004). The preservation and maintenance of the knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities: The role of education [electronic version], 1-15. Retrieved 28 October 2006.

Martin, N. (1991). Research methodology in education and indigenous life in Papua New Guinea. In D. Jones, L. Meek & J. Weeks (Eds.). *Explorations in higher education: A South Pacific critique* (pp. 95-102). Melbourne: The Centre for the study of higher education, University of Melbourne.

Meek, V. L. & Davies, D. (2009). Policy dynamics in higher education and research: Concepts and observations. In V. L. Meek, U. Teichler, and M. Kearney, *Higher education, research, and innovation: Changing dynamics* (41-84)*,* Kassel: UNESCO/INCHER.

MGMT90113 - Tertiary education policy and management (August, 2013). Course notes – Summary of Part A: Comparative tertiary education policy studies.

Narokobi, B. (1980). *The Melanesian Way*. Port Moresby: Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies.

Nekitel, O. (2000). Curriculum relevance and teaching. In A. Maha & T. Flaherty (Eds.), *Education for 21st Century in Papua New Guinea and the South Pacific* (pp. 133 - 145). University of Goroka: The University of Goroka and The Summer Institute of Linguistics.

PNG Constitution Review Committee. (1975). *The Constitution of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea*. Port Moresby, Netley: The Griffin Press.

Quinn, R., Faerman, S., Thompson, M., McGrath, M., and St Clair, L. (2007). The competing values approach to management. In Quinn, et al., *Becoming a master manager: A competing values approach* (1-34), Hoboken NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Rannells, J., & Matatier, E. (2005). *PNG fact book* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Report of a post-audit implementation review (May 2014). Port Moresby: Office of Higher Education, Science, Research and Technology.

Santiago, P. Trenblay, K., Basri, E. and Arnal, E. (2008). Internationalisation: shaping strategies in the national context. *Tertiary education for the knowledge society*, Volume 2 (235-309), Paris: OECD.

Sharrock, G. (2012). Four management agendas for Australian universities, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 34(3), 323-337.

Thaman, K. (2006). Acknowledging indigenous knowledge systems in higher education in the Pacific Island Region. In V. L. Meek, and C. Suwanwela, (Eds.), *Higher education, research, and knowledge in the Asia-Pacific Region* (175-184). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Author

Maretta Alup Kula-Semos is currently the Vice President, Research and Postgraduate studies at the Divine Word University. She is an advocate for indigenous knowledges finding its voice in the academy, especially, within the larger field of research methodologies. In this article the argument is made for the repositioning to adequately cater for the challenges associated with knowledge management in higher education. Email: mkulasemos@dwu.ac.pg