

**Globalism, Neo-liberalism, Public Schools and Higher Education: Is  
Your Academic Institution Moving Toward Corporate Model Under  
Globalism and Neo-liberalism: What Is Being Said And Done Around  
You And What Should You Observe, Say And Do?**

**Readings Compiled by  
Amarjit Singh  
Faculty of Education  
Memorial University of Newfoundland**

This compilation of readings has four parts:

1. Introduction 2. Purpose 3. Organization. The organization part is divided into three sections. The first section, presents a brief annotated bibliography of eighteen selected books that shed light on the interaction among higher education, globalization and neo-liberalism. The second section includes synopses, book descriptions and editorial book reviews of five books that appear on Amazon.Com. The third section tackles the question: Is your academic institution moving towards becoming a corporate like institution under the influence of globalism and neo-liberalism? This is done by way of presenting relatively lengthy excerpts from Giroux's *Take Back Higher Education*, and from Gerard Delanty's article, "Does the university have a future?" and from an article by Jan Currie, "The neo-liberal paradigm and higher education: a critique". 4. This last part presents larger perspectives on globalism, neo-liberalism, public schools and higher education, suggesting how market institutions and investment in education can, at times, serve public interests.

## **PART ONE**

### **Introduction**

Neo-liberal globalization has become a buzz-word of our time. It is, then, no surprise that many of our colleagues have been writing on this and related topics such as the transformation of modernity, collaboration, technology, the turn to downsizing over the past several years (see the articles by Drs. Kim, McCann, Kennedy, Barrel, and Singh's reflective notes on downsizing, modernity, cultural worker and leadership in the previous issues of *the Morning Watch*, *the 2006-2007 issue*, *Multiple Perspective...*). In fact, I wrote in 1977 that "Future educational systems will have to either adjust to the new world economic order which is being put together now or mediate it. An important element in mediating one's social milieu is to understand it as comprehensively as possible." (Singh 1977, p. 105). My intention in that article was to discuss some of the basic concepts related to the on-going debates on the critical and complex issues in the area of the then new international economic order, international relations, international cooperation, and national development. In the same article I reviewed many books and documents that contained blue-prints for organizing educational systems, and for learning and teaching in the future. For that reason, at the end of the article, I provided a lengthy reading list for Social Studies teachers, educators with a diversity of interests, undergraduate and graduate students planning to work in schools, and those who occupy decision-making

positions who might find the suggested reading useful. The feedback to that and other similar articles I earlier wrote for my students and other stakeholders in education was encouraging and positive.

Over the years many more writers have raised a myriad of questions about globalization, and how its various aspects affect higher education and K-12 public education. For example, Giroux (2004) asks: "How do we understand the university in light of both the crisis of youth and the related crisis of the social under neo-liberalism? How can the future be conceptualized given the erosion of the social and public life over the last 20 years and the corporatization of higher education?" (230). With similar concerns about how to act now for creating a better future, Heather-Jane Robertson (1998) and Maud Barlow and Heather-Jane Robertson (1994) have raised many questions about neo-liberalism and the functioning of multinational corporations and have analyzed the assault of globalization on Canadian public schools using the frame work of "class warfare", while David Berliner (1996) wrote about the myths, fraud and the attack on America's public schools using the idea of the "manufactured crisis" and Engle (2000) about market ideology vs. democratic values in relation to the struggle for control of public education. At another level of analysis, George Ritzer (1995) wrote about the MacDonalidization of society and everyday life in the age of neo-liberal globalization. John Hoben's article in this issue of the *Morning Watch* also discusses problems related to market ideology and higher education. In different ways, among many others, these books and articles offer some suggestions and guidance as to how to understand problems existing in everyday life and how to take practical actions in the age of neo-liberalism.

I compiled the material presented here in January 2005, basically for discussion, educational, and individual and collective awareness purposes. I have slightly updated the material by way of providing more references in the end, which are not cited in the body of this paper. Those extra references capture recent discourses surrounding existing form of neo-liberalism and globalization, how they perpetuate conditions for various forms of domination and exploitation of millions of people globally and locally, and what needs to be done to eliminate or reduce effects of those conditions on the lives of those who find themselves dominated and exploited in all spheres of daily life-economically, socially, psychologically, politically, morally, ethically and legally. Together, readings cited in this paper critically engage ideologies of "There Is No Alternative", "The End of History" and "The End of Ideology". Instead, these readings articulate a sense of hope, possibilities and a stance that demonstrates that there is an alternative to neoliberal globalization. This stance is rooted in the moral and ethical commitment to acting as enabling human beings, individually and collectively, having the political will and the desire to create sustainable societies and cultures based on equitable human relationships at global, local and regional levels. Before we move to part two, a cautionary note may be in order: the readers may not quote directly from this article; for that purpose they should check the original articles and books that I have cited here in.

## PART TWO

### Purpose

It is in the spirit of the goals expressed above that I have put this article together at this time. The hope is that this material, to some extent, may enable readers (students, especially graduate students, colleagues, teachers, and other stakeholders in education), to understand how the institutional discourse in universities and schools of neo-liberal globalism trickles down as a bureaucratic response to actions and demands of those who wish to mediate complete and unbalanced corporatization of universities and public schooling, and how administrative/managerial response homogenizes the social understanding of the counter corporatization demand within its managerial parameters. This neo-liberal globalism concerns itself with: downsizing, outsourcing, efficiency, accountability, standards, micro-management, fiscal responsibility, centralizing of administrative authority, deskilling of academic and non-academic staff, streamlining curricula, on-line delivering of course through using various technological devices, nationalism, patriotism, localism, immigration, diversity of experiences and aspiration, just-in-time (JIT) and just-in-case (JIC) approaches to higher education and schooling, and social stratification based on race, class, gender, special needs, sexual preferences. My colleagues and I have done a variety of work in our local contexts in order to make sense of some of these trends within globalism. In particular we have written about how these trends have surfaced in many local and global educational reform reports since the 1980s (Singh, "Making sense of the educational reform reports, part 1 and 2", *The Morning Watch* Books, 1991, Vol. 1). Therefore, in light of our recent local work, and works done by others internationally, I am interested in encouraging everyone interested in education and society to become a "reflective researcher and educator" as Burnaford et al. have suggested in their (2001) book. Singh et al. (2001) have provided a review of literature on the notion of "reflective educator" in their research on teacher internship program and education of future educators in Newfoundland and other countries. I also suggest that each student and teacher become an apt actor in the field of institutional ethnography as developed by Dorothy Smith, a Canadian feminist sociologist (Smith 1987, 1990a, 1990b) and Campbell and Gregor (2004). Carroll (2004) comments that institutional ethnography, according to Campbell and Gregor, "aims to answer questions about how everyday life is organized". In their book, the relationship of micro to macro processes is "conceptualized in terms of ruling relations". Further, Carroll points out that the notion of institutional ethnography, as developed by Campbell and Gregor, "is remarkably well suited to the human service curriculum and the training of professional and activists. Its strategy for learning how to understand problems existing in everyday life appeals to many researchers who are looking for guidance on how to take practical action." It would seem that many of these ideas – functioning as reflective educator and researcher, and as ethnographer in various situations - are related to other concepts such as people functioning as intellectuals and cultural workers at various specific sites as developed by Griroux, and others working in the areas of cultural studies, colonial studies, critical race theories, critical negotiation perspective, and verities of postcolonial studies. Singh (*The Morning Watch*, 2006-2007 issue, *The Multiple Perspectives---2007*) has reviewed aspects of this discourse as it relates to downsizing process in an academic unit. Besides the perspectives of functioning as reflective researchers, educators, intellectuals and

cultural workers, Kaufman (2003), Mills (1959) and Cherryholmes (1988) provide other critical ways that offer guidance on how to take practical action. For example, Kaufman has discussed some of those ways in her book in an engaging and accessible style. However, below I will focus on strategies for learning how to understand and solve problems that exist in everyday life as suggested by C.W. Mills and Cherryholmes.

C. Wright Mills in his classic book, *The Sociological Imagination* (1959) talks about the idea of the sociological imagination. He defined the sociological imagination as “... the capacity to shift from one perspective to another - from the political to psychological; from examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budget of the world; from the theological school to the military establishment; from considerations of an oil industry to studies of contemporary poetry. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self - and to see the relations between the two. Back of its use there is always the urge to know the social and historical meaning of the individual in the society and in the period in which he has his quality and his being (p. 7, 1971-72 print).

In this book among other things, Mills suggested that we ask the question “...what varieties of men and women now prevail in this society and in this period? And what varieties are coming to prevail? In what ways are they selected and formed, liberated and repressed, made sensitive and blunted?”(p. 7). Mills was interested in what kinds of ‘human nature’ are revealed in the conduct and character we observe around us as well as what is meant by ‘human nature’ for the features of the society we are examining.

Cleo Cherryholmes in his book, *Rethinking Education* (1988) offered another strategy of rethinking educational discourse and practice which my students and I have found very helpful on how to take practical action. According to Cherryholmes “‘rethinking education, discourse-practice’ means looking at what practitioners and researchers [in any profession] say and do ...” (p. 2) He then explains his ideas related to the notions of discourse, practice, and discourse-practice. He goes on to identify and critique prominent structural themes in education discourse and practice. He draws upon the ideas of Foucault, Derrida, Rorty, and Habermas. Cherryholmes states that “as societies and professions develop, what is said and written and accepted as true changes. Discourse and discursive practices are relative to time and place.” (p. 3) Furthermore, what we say and do involves communication. He states that “communication is action as well as interaction; subject to multiple readings and interpretations; anticipatory of the ideal speech situation; bounded by time, place, and the exercise of power; and subject to deconstruction” (p. 167). In this communication perspective, listening to the perspectives and voices of others is a critical and reflective activity. Listening and hearing are not the same processes. Many scholars now believe that these insights relating to the communication process were most forcefully developed in the works of George Herbert Mead in his discussion on the development of “the social self”, and now extended by contemporary continental scholars such as Habermas and others (Odin, 1996; Denzin, 1992; Aboulafia 1986, 2001; Aboulafia, Myra Bookman and Catherine Kemp 2002).

How do we bring these ideas and concepts to our own world? Following Mills and Cherryholmes, we can ask ourselves who are the significant men and women in universities and the public schools? What do they say and do in those contexts? How do they communicate issues related to education and society, globalism and neo-liberalism, and the relations between local and global interests? What ideologies and mindsets lie behind their thinking and action? In university contexts, of course, these men and women are officials of the university (presidents, deans, directors, head of departments, board members, faculty and student union executives, and sometimes prominent professor and researchers) who have considerable power in the management of the university. Therefore, it is important to observe what they say and do in a variety of sites (public meetings, university committees, convocations, varieties of celebrations, and other official and non-official gatherings on the campus and using communication channels such as internal memos, reports and newspapers). Similarly, at the level of K-12 schooling, such men and women are principals, vice-principals, department heads, school board officials, officials of various parents' organizations, officials of the government departments, especially departments of education and, other stakeholders interested in the public education, such as those working in the media and the cultural industry. It is important to have varieties of intellectual tools in one's hand (i.e., concepts, theories, perspectives, research methodologies; pedagogical and educational models for social and political actions; awareness of local, institutional and situational knowledge; perspectives such as social production of knowledge, archeology of knowledge, social positioning by experts and intellectuals in social structures through uses of power relations, queer theory, disability studies, whiteness studies, militarization studies, critical decolonization, genocide and human rights studies, and lessons learnt through the outcomes of various local, regional, national and international social movements) in order to be able to observe what those men and women say and do, and what their "cultures" are. (Singh, *The Morning Watch*, 2006-2007 issue, *The Multiple Perspectives---*, 2007, chapter 77, 827-833). Having such intellectual tools are necessary, if not essential, in order to gain insights and guidance to understanding dynamics of events taking place around our daily life, and to know how to take practical action. How should we go about observing what is being said and done around us, and what should we observe, say and do if we desire to keep schools and universities functioning as sustainable and egalitarian academic institutions, while taking into account necessary adjustment that must be made to meet the demands of globalization forces?

The compilation of work done by selected scholars in this paper and their perspectives, I believe, provide some guidance on how to tell if the academic institution in which we work is moving toward a corporate model under globalism and neo-liberalism.

## **PART THREE**

### **Organization**

The material in this paper is put together in a certain fashion, as the intention is educational. There are three features that characterize the organization of the paper.

First, the paper presents a brief annotated bibliography of eighteen selected books that shed light on interaction among higher education, globalization and neo-liberalism. This is intended to enable readers to access a large spectrum of arguments, made by various scholars, as sensitizing background material to allow greater appreciation of emerging trends in higher education.

Secondly, the paper includes synopsis, book descriptions and editorial book reviews of five books that appear on Amazon.Com: Books. I have selected these recent books which are used widely. I use these books in graduate and undergraduate courses which deal with the topic of globalization, neo-liberalism, higher education, K-12 schooling, democracy and other related issues such as role of technology in delivering on-line courses vs. face-to-face teaching and learning. Of these books, two are by Henry A. Giroux and Susan Giroux (*Take Back Higher Education (2000)*] and, *The Terror of Neo-liberalism: Cultural Politics and the Promise of Democracy (2004)*, two are by Manfred B. Steger (*Globalism: The New Market Ideology (2001)* and, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction (2003)* and, one by Michael Engel (*The Struggle for Control of Public Education: Market Ideology vs. Democratic Values (2000)*). These reviews on Amazon provide readers with quick information on these books.

Thirdly, the paper presents relatively lengthy excerpts from Giroux's *Take Back Higher Education*, and from Gerard Delanty's article, "Does the university have a future?" and from an article by Jan Currie, "The neo-liberal paradigm and higher education: a critique". The latter articles appear in Odin, J.K. and Manicas, P.T. (Eds.). *Globalization and Higher Education (2004)*. As a university teacher for the last thirty five years, my students and I have found that sometimes, somewhat long, full length excerpts are needed be savored properly. Moreover, long excerpts more often better serve readers. In the final analysis, indeed, students and others have to aspire to read the works of these authors themselves. The intent here is to help busy people have access to current and crucial information.

## **SECTION A**

### **Selected Annotated Bibliography**

Aronowitz, Stanley. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon, 2000. Aronowitz attempts to connect labor market issues with education in a useful way, even though he finds no justification for employing the new technologies to higher education.

Berube, Michael, and Cary Nelson (eds.). *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics and the Crisis of the Humanities*. New York: Routledge, 1995. This volume focuses on the recent cultural wars. Those interested in the right-wing plomic may find Barry Gross's discussion the most interesting.

Clark, Burton R. *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon, 2001. Sheldon Rothblatt writes (on Amazon): "Here is an exploration, at once empirical and conceptual, in

language that is sharp and effective, of the way we live now. Clark looks for and finds pathways out of current difficulties that address that old dilemma in the history of universities: how to escape from the vexations of the present without losing sight of the qualities that made universities so very special in the first place."

Cole, Jonathan R., Elinor G. Barber, and Stephen R. Graubard (eds.). *The Research University in a Time of Discontent*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993. Contributors to this volume include five presidents (two emeriti), one VP (of Rockefeller), two provosts, the CEO of the Academy of Sciences, the president emeritus of the Association of American Universities, the editor of *Daedalus*, and three well-known neo-conservative social scientists. They mainly defend current practices in higher education.

Currie, Jan, and Janice Angela Newson (eds.). *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage, 1998. This volume provides comparative commentary on higher education in Australia, America, Canada, Norway, France, and NAFTA's impact on Mexican universities.

Delanty, Gerard. *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2001. Odin and Manicas write that "if we had to pick one book, this would be it. Delanty offers a very well-informed account of the modern university in transition, from its beginnings to today. He seems to have read everyone that is pertinent.... and has put it together in a convincing way. He argues that the late 1960s and 1970s were critical, both as regards "organized modernity," a dramatic shift in the production and legitimation of knowledge, and then as regards the self-understanding of the university. But unlike those who hold to grim scenarios (either postmodern or instrumentalist), he offers that the role of the university could be enhanced in a direction that would contribute to more democratic and cosmopolitan forms of citizenship.

Duderstadt, James J. *A University for the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000. Duderstadt writes as a former president of the University of Michigan. He mainly focuses on the governance issues and states that "the history of higher education in America suggests that, in reality, the faculty has had relatively little influence over the evolution of the university" [247]. He also discusses the causes and consequences of "privatization," and the challenge of the new technologies that could promote "the growth of entirely new learning organizations" (304).

Inayatullah, Sohail, and Jennifer Gidley (eds.). *The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 2000? This volume provides very good comparative material on higher education.

Jarvis, Peter. *Universities and Corporate Universities: The Higher Learning Indf in Global Society*. London: Kegan Paul, 2001. Jarvis talks about McDonald's Hamburger University and the British Open University. He makes a point by quoting Kenny Wallace that "traditional universities are no longer the

- dominant-players in the creation and communication of knowledge, especially in cyberspace. Just-in-case education has moved to just-in-time and just-for-you ... [Plato.com](http://Plato.com) has arrived" (113).
- Lucas, Christopher J. *Crisis in the Academy: Rethinking Higher-Education in America*. New York: St. Martin's, 1996. In reviewing this book, Odin and Manicas state that the book provides "a historical account that demystifies some prevailing beliefs, for example, about general education, tenure, open admission, the culture of faculties, and governance. Lucas offers some very positive ideas for reform, including, for example, abandoning the idea of a disciplinary department as an autonomous unit for resource allocations and redesigning administrative configurations that would enable realizing clearly articulated goals, which include the development of skills, general education, vocational training, and then assessing the outcomes: an effort at "truth-in-advertising." The volume is weak on new technologies and their potential." (257)
- Readings, Bill. *University in Ruins*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996. Odin and Manicas write that "the basic argument is that the modern university came into existence as an embodiment of German idealist thought, mediated by Humboldt and Newman, and had as its goal the transmission of 'culture.' But since 'the nation-state is no longer the primary instance of the reproduction of global capitals, 'culture'-as the symbolic and political counterpart of the project of integration pursued by the nation-state-has lost its purchase" (12). Readings concludes that 'we should try to replace the empty idea of excellence with the empty name of Thought.' Unlike 'excellence,' Thought 'does not masquerade as an idea' (160). (257)
- Rothblatt, Sheldon, and Bjorn Wittrock (eds.). *The European and American University Since 1800: Historical and Sociological Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. The book contains the most useful set of historical and comparative material.
- Ruch, Richard S. *Higher Ed, Inc.: The Rise of the For-Profit University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001. This book is an extremely helpful description of the rise of the for-profit educational institutions and the consequences for the non profits. For Ruch, "the question and the challenge is not whether to become more responsive, but how to do so in the face of a tradition of resistance, a history of inertia, and a system of decision making that inhibits quick decisions and rapid response to change" (151).
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. The authors conclude: "We see academic capitalism in general, and science and technology in particular, as bringing about broad change in higher education to the point where the center of the academy has shifted from a liberal arts core to an entrepreneurial periphery" (207). The authors provide two very persuasive "scenarios," a worst case and a best case (242-245), but neither is encouraging.



- Smith, Charles W. *Market Values in American Higher Education: The Pitfalls and Promises*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000. Odin and Manicas write that "Smith finds a number of 'false diagnoses and faulty cures,' for example, serious misreading of the fiscal and *organizational* realities, which have resulted in a 'paste and mix response' to growth in higher education. He argues that we need to decide what we want and determine clearly what we have, and concludes with some 'guiding principles' and specific recommendations." (258)
- Solomon, Robert and John. *Up the University: Recreating Higher Education*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1993. Odin and Manicas write that the authors have "--- one very powerful thesis: universities exist to teach undergraduates, but indeed, they are currently structured so as to make this nearly impossible. The obstacles begin with corporate administration, and extend to distortion regarding 'research,' the Ph.D. dissertation, the institutionalization of departments, and the reward system of faculty, including cynical "teaching awards" and the tenure system. The Solomons reject nailing the faculty as 'easy targets' (e.g., as with Sykes's *Profscam*) and argue for strong faculty governance; but they are not clear whether many (or most) faculty are clear themselves about what they should be doing and just cannot, or whether the typical faculty's warm endorsement of 'liberal education' suggests that they are serious victims of ideologies that sustain all those practices that they rightly condemn." (258)
- Spring, Joel. *Education and the Rise of Global Economy*. Mahwah, NJ.: Erlbaum, 1998. The author had argued (in *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State*, 1972) that "only elimination of government-operated schools could produce the freedom of thought required for the exercise of democratic power" (xi). Spring now considers this to be naive "in the face of the uncontrolled power of global corporations." So, now he thinks that "the right to an education should include an education in human rights and democratic power."
- Sykes, Charles J. *Pro/scam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. New York: St. Martin's, 1990. The author views the professorate singularly as responsible for most of the problems in higher education. Sykes states that: "The story of the collapse of American higher education is the story of the rise of the professorate. No understanding of the academic disease is possible without an understanding of the Academic Man, this strange mutation of 20th century academia who has the pretensions of an ecclesiastic, the artfulness of witch doctor, and the soul of a bureaucrat. Almost single-handedly, the professors have destroyed the university as a center of learning and have desolated higher education". (Quoted by Solomon and Solomon. See above, 204f).
- White, Geoffrey D. (ed.). *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. Amherst: Prometheus, 2000. This book offers essays by "leftish" critics of higher education.

## SECTION B

### <Amazon.com> Globalization, Neo-liberalism, Public and Higher Education

The following editorial reviews of books appear on Amazon.Com: Books. They are reproduced here only for educational purposes. The text in bold letters below represents the material taken from Amazon.Com.Books:

#### **Globalization: A Very Short Introduction (Very Short Introductions)** by [Manfred B. Steger](#)

#### Synopsis

'Globalization' has become the buzz-word of our time. A growing number of scholars and political activists have invoked the term to describe a variety of changing economic, political, cultural, ideological, and environmental processes that are alleged to have accelerated in the last few decades. Rather than forcing such a complex social phenomenon into a single conceptual framework, Manfred Steger presents globalization in plain, readable English as a multifaceted process encompassing global, regional, and local aspects of social life. In addition to explaining the various dimensions of globalization, the author explores whether globalization should be considered a 'good' or 'bad' thing - a question that has been hotly debated in classrooms, boardrooms, and on the streets.

#### Product Description:

This book offers a stimulating introduction to globalization and its varying impacts across, between, and within societies. It is a highly readable text that contributes to a better understanding of the crucial aspects and dimensions of the developments and transformations that go by the name of globalization.

#### Customer

Avg.

[Write an online review](#) and share your thoughts with other customers.

Reviews  
Customer

3 of 3 people found the following review helpful:

★★★★★ A superb brief introduction to a complex issue, August 19, 2004

**Reviewer:**

[Robert W. Moore](#) (Chicago, IL USA) - [See all my reviews](#)

TR RN

This truly is a dazzling brief introduction to a subject that could not be covered even by a very long book. As Steger points out, the fact of globalization is the predominant issue of our time. Far too many, as he points out, tend to treat the subject in monolithic or simplistic fashion, focusing on merely one aspect of globalization, and assuming that that aspect defines all of globalization. Anyone familiar with Thomas Friedman's *THE LEXUS AND THE OLIVE TREE* (who is frequently described as a "hyper globalizer") will recognize one such very narrow approach. Despite his brief space, Steger wants to do justice to the complexity of the subject. For the past decade, most writers on globalization have focused on economic globalization, but Steger emphasizes that the process has political, economic, religious, cultural, environmental, and ideological conditions.

Many people who tackle the question of globalization seem to want to know, "Is this a good or bad thing?" Steger is anxious to emphasize that this does not admit of an easy answer. Clearly, the massive increase of economic inequality--which occurs both on international and national levels, e.g., wealth has more and more been concentrated in the industrial countries of the northern hemisphere, and within those countries, more and more in the hands of a small economic corporate and investing elite--is not a good thing, but that is not the only aspect of globalization. Steger seems to suggest that there are both significant advantages and some lamentable dangers in globalization.

The one aspect of globalization concerning which Steger is clearly and rightfully concerned is the promotion of globalization in the ideological terms of the Neoliberal project of promoting free markets over all other concerns. The term "Neoliberal" might throw some people, since the leading Neoliberal of recent decades would include Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, and most members of the George W. Bush administration (though also many in the Clinton administration, including Clinton himself). Too many are unaware that Reagan and Bush are not conservatives by traditional understandings of the label: they both pushed for massive governmental intrusion into the markets, in taking an active role in eliminating regulation, and actively employing the government to control the economy, none of which are conservative projects. One reason that the Progressive movement gained so much steam during the McKinley, Roosevelt, and Wilson years was observing the extraordinary corruption and narrow concentration of wealth (and subsequent economic inequality) that resulted from an unregulated market economy. Steger, along with a host of others, points out that with the unfettered promotion of free market capitalism with little or no governmental regulatory control (Neoliberalism's big project) is once again resulting in extreme economic inequality. Numerous studies, to some of which he refers, have undermined one of the central claims of the Neo-liberal project: that expanding world markets spreads wealth throughout the world; in fact, it actually shifts wealth into the hands of a very few, a trend that has been taking place not only on a global scale, but on the national level as well (e.g., according to Federal Reserve statistics, in 1979

1% of the population possessed 20% of the wealth in the U.S., while in 1997 the top 1% held 37%, a percentage that has surely exploded following the two massive Bush tax cuts). What I believe Steger could have emphasized even more is that economic inequality is likely going to be THE world issue in the decades to come, as it is likely to become the major issue in American politics as well (given a thirty year history of a massive shift of wealth from the middle class to a very small number of citizens).

My one complaint with the book is that many of the figures and graphs were close to unintelligible. Also, given the small format, sometimes the text and text boxes were laid out rather awkwardly. I found the annotated bibliography to be of great help in mapping out future reading (I sometimes wish that publishers would require all authors of academic books to provide either an annotated bibliography or a bibliographic essay; over the years I've probably learned of more good books to read in this fashion than in any other).

I have read several of the volumes in the Oxford University Press Very Short Introductions series, and this easily ranks as one of my favorites. I highly recommend it to anyone wanting to gain a handle on one of the crucial issues of our time.

*Globalism: The New Market Ideology*  
by [Manfred B. Steger](#)

### *Synopsis*

**Globalism: The New Market Ideology** rejects the notion that we find ourselves at the end of ideology and that democracy has won. Instead, Steger argues that the opening decade of the 21st century will constitute a teeming battlefield of clashing ideologies. The chief protagonist is the dominant neoliberal market ideology Steger calls "globalism." Although globalism constitutes little more than a gigantic repackaging of old laissez-faire ideas, it deserves the label "new market ideology" because its advocates have been able to link their quaint free-market concepts with cutting-edge "global talk." At the same time, globalism has already encountered serious ideological challengers from both the political left and right. The anti-WTO protests in Seattle and the demonstrations against the IMF and World Bank in Prague are just the opening salvos of the coming battle over the meaning and direction of globalization. After identifying and evaluating the five central claims of globalism--including assertions that "globalization is inevitable," "nobody is in charge of globalization," and "globalization benefits everyone" -- Steger offers an overview of the counterclaims made by anti-globalist forces. Since this ideological struggle will deeply influence the crucial political and ethical questions of the new century, this book seeks to provide readers with an understanding of how dominant beliefs about globalization fashion their realities, and that these ideas and values can be changed in a more egalitarian direction.

***The Terror of Neoliberalism (Cultural Politics & the Promise of Democracy)***  
by [Henry A. Giroux](#)

**Synopsis**

This book argues that neo-liberalism is not simply an economic theory but also a set of values, ideologies, and practices that works more like a cultural field that is not only refiguring political and economic power, but eliminating the very categories of the social and political as essential elements of democratic life. Neoliberalism has become the most dangerous ideology of our time. Collapsing the link between corporate power and the state, neoliberalism is putting into place the conditions for a new kind of authoritarianism in which large sections of the population are increasingly denied the symbolic and economic capital necessary for engaged citizenship. Moreover, as corporate power gains a stranglehold on the media, the educational conditions necessary for a democracy are undermined as politics is reduced to a spectacle, essentially both depoliticizing politics and privatizing culture. This series addresses the relationship among culture, power, politics, and democratic struggles. Focusing on how culture offers opportunities that may expand and deepen the prospects for an inclusive democracy, it draws from struggles over the media, youth, political economy, workers, race, feminism, and more, highlighting how each offers a site of both resistance and transformation.

**Product Description:**

Neo-liberalism has become the most influential ideology of our times. It guides both Democratic and Republican policies and, increasingly, those of European and developing countries worldwide. Influential cultural critic Henry Giroux assesses the impact of neo-liberalism and points in this book to better approaches to building real democracy.

Neo-liberalism, too commonly regarded an economic theory, is a complex of values, ideologies, and practices that work more broadly as a "cultural field." Giroux argues that its cultural dimensions erode the public participation that is the very foundation of democratic life. Under neo-liberal policies, Giroux shows, populations are increasingly denied the symbolic, educational, and economic capital necessary for engaged citizenship. Giroux assesses the impact of neo-liberalism on the language of democracy, race, education, and the media, offering alternatives necessary to restore our democratic institution.

***Take Back Higher Education: Race, Youth, and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era***  
by [Henry A. Giroux](#), [Susan Searls Giroux](#)

**Synopsis**

At the beginning for the new millennium, higher education is under siege. No longer viewed as a public good, higher education increasingly is besieged by

corporate, right-wing and conservative ideologies that want to decouple higher education from its legacy of educating students to be critical and autonomous citizens, imbued with democratic and public values. The greatest danger faced by higher education comes from the focus of global neo-liberalism and the return of educational apartheid. Through the power of racial backlash, the war on youth, deregulation, commercialism, and privatization, neo-liberalism wages a vicious assault on all of those public spheres and goods not controlled by the logic of market relations and profit margins. Hijacking Higher Education argues that if higher education is going to meet the challenges of a democratic future, it will have to confront neo-liberalism, racism, and the shredding of the social contract.

#### Product Description:

Higher education is under siege. No longer viewed as a public good, it is attacked by businesses who want to refashion institutions in the image of the marketplace. Higher education is the target of cultural conservatives who have undermined academic freedom and access by deriding the academy as a hotbed of left-multicultural-radicalism and anti-Americanism. The historic mission to educate students as citizens motivated by democratic values is overshadowed by profit margins. Giroux and Giroux argue that the greatest danger faced by higher education comes from corporatization and educational apartheid. If higher education is to meet the challenges of a democratic future, it must encourage students to be critical thinkers and citizens, as it vouchsafes conditions for educators to produce scholarship in the service of an inclusive democracy.

#### *The Struggle for Control of Public Education: Market Ideology Vs. Democratic Values*

by [Michael Engel](#)

#### Synopsis

Those making decisions about education today argue that market strategies promote democratic educational reform, when really they promote market reform of education. Michael Engel argues against this tendency, siding with democratic values and calls for a return to community-controlled schools.

#### Product Description:

"One hundred years ago, children were kept out of school to be used as a cheap factory workforce; today, they are kept in school to become a cheap workforce in the factories of the future."

Seduced by the language of the market economy, those making decisions about education today argue that market strategies promote democratic educational reform, when really they promote market reform of education.

Michael Engel argues against this tendency, siding with democratic values-- which encourage openness, creativity, social awareness, and idealism, whereas market values uphold individual achievement, competition, economic growth, and national security.

Behind the façade of progressive rhetoric, advocates of these corporate models have succeeded in imposing their definition of school reform through federal and state policy makers. As a result, communities lose control of their schools, teachers lose control of their work, and students lose control of their futures. Engel attacks the increasing dominance of market ideology in educational policy and extends his critique beyond such trends in school reform as vouchers, charter schools, and "contracting out" to include issues such as decentralization, computer technology, and standards.

The debate over privatization amounts to ideological warfare between democratic and market values. The question is not so much about "school choice" as it is about the values Americans want at the root of their society. Unprecedented in its value-based challenge to the threat of market ideology to educational policy, *The Struggle for Control of Public Education* is a sophisticated call for a return to community-controlled schools and democratic values. This argument offers theoretical and practical models crafted in the contemporary feminist and social reconstructionist tradition. Readers interested in the study of educational policies, philosophy, and policy will find this book engaging.

### Customer Reviews

Avg. Customer Review:

[Write an online review](#) and share your thoughts with other customers.

2 of 2 people found the following review helpful:

Misunderstands both Democracy and Markets, November 5, 2003

Reviewer: [Nathan Barclay](#) (Huntsville, AL United States) - [See all my reviews](#)

This book had me both seriously annoyed and seriously confused within just a few pages. In the finest Orwellian tradition, the author redefines "democracy" to include some sort of socialist or quasi-socialist concept of economics that is taken for granted but never clearly defined. Thus, when he argues for "democratic" education, what he really argues for is an education system that follows his view of what a "democratic" society ought to look like - a view that he labels "democratic" without regard to whether it's what the majority wants.

The author correctly emphasizes the importance of cooperation toward shared goals to a democratic society. But he completely misses the fact that cooperating voluntarily in smaller groups is often better than fighting each other in the political arena over who gets to force their will onto everyone. As a result, he does a gross injustice to those of us who view the application of market forces in education not merely as an exercise in self-interest but as a way to achieve the fundamentally democratic goal of helping as many families



as possible get as much of what they want as possible in their children's schools.

I do think the author has some worthwhile points regarding the dangers of some particular "reform" ideas that attempt to partially incorporate market principles without incorporating the most important market principle of all choice. But even those would come across a lot better if the author didn't display an almost blind hatred toward markets.

Reviewer: ["snozzberry"](#) (Austin, TX USA) - [See all my reviews](#)

I originally picked up this book because of its Civic Education chapter. After I read that (excellent) chapter, I started reading other parts of the book as well.

If you care about the future of our schools, our children, and our country, you should read this book. Engel will open your eyes to the real and disturbing trend of corporate influence in public education.

In his conclusion, he urges you to get involved with your local school board, which never receives much input from the community. Go to the board meetings, find a candidate you support and help him/her win, run for the board yourself...just do SOMETHING before it's too late and we've lost control of our schools.

Was this review helpful to you?

## SECTION C

### **Is Your Academic Institution Moving Towards Becoming A Corporate Like Institution Under The Influence Of Globalism and Neo-liberalism?**

Is your academic institution moving towards becoming a corporate like institution? What should we observe to be able to say – yes, it is becoming like a corporate institution. And what should we say and do if we want to keep it as an academic institution while at the same time adapt to changes ushered by globalization, neo-liberalism, and corporations based on the logic of the market? How can we find in-between ways to do both? This section includes lengthy excerpts (see the introduction above) from the writings of Gerard Delanty, Jan Currie and Henry A. Giroux. I have selected these excerpts with the hope that they will offer readers some intellectual and practical tools (language, concepts, theories, research data and perspectives) which will offer them guidance on what to observe and how to take practical action. The text in bold letters below represents the material taken from their writings.



## What Is A University?

Let us first proceed by asking the question: What is a university? In his article entitled "Does the university have future?" Gerard Delanty (241-243) states the following:

**"The DEBATE ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY today is very different from some of the major debates on the university over the past century and a half. The grandiose and programmatic visions of the modern university in the seminal works of Cardinal John Henry Newman, Karl Jaspers, Talcott Parsons, Jurgen Habermas, Alvin Gouldner, and Pierre Bourdieu reflected the self-confidence of the university as an institution with a moral and cultural mission. Today the debate has shifted to a defensive stance on the one side and on the other to a largely negative view of the university as an anachronistic institution clinging to a modernity in ruins. On the whole the current debate is dominated by the liberal view of the university as a bastion of high modernity and the postmodern thesis of the obsolescence of the university along with the institutions of modernity in the allegedly global age of informational capitalism. It is the aim of this chapter to offer an alternative view to these positions that look either to culture or to technology.**

The liberal conception of the university goes back to the mid-nineteenth century, having its roots in the idea of the university proposed in Cardinal John Henry Newman's famous book, *The Idea of the University* (1852). More of a conservative idea than a liberal one, the aim of a liberal education, according to Newman and many who were to follow him, is to transmit the received wisdom of the past into the minds of youth in order to secure the passing on of tradition. The liberal view of the university thus held to a conception of the university that was essentially reproductive rather than creative of new knowledge. In this view, with its origins in English pastoral care and liberal Irish Catholicism, science and the world of research was subordinated to teaching. This vision of the university was resurrected in the 1980s culture wars by conservative and radical liberals alike. Traditional liberals such as Allan Bloom in his *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987) saw the high and universalistic culture of the university under attack by the low and relativistic culture coming from politics and popular cultures. Others, such as Russell Jacoby, saw the universalistic intellectual being overshadowed by the expert, leading to intellectual paralysis of the university. Despite the defensive and varied nature of the liberal response, there was never any doubt that the university could withstand the intrusion of the low culture. As exemplified in the classic work of Pierre Bourdieu, the university houses "state nobility," in which forms of cultural capital are perpetuated.

In the 1990s, as the culture wars abated, another and more potent debate took place that was less defensive than offensive in tone. This has generally been part of the postmodern attack on modernity. The post modern critique—as in Bill Readings' well-known book, *The University in Ruins* (1996), which was reiterated in Lyotard's *Postmodern Condition* (1997)—argued that as an institution of modernity the university would suffer the same fate as the nation-state. Globalization, it was argued, is eroding the presuppositions of the

university as an institution that serves the state. The result is the end of knowledge along with the end of modernity and the end of the nation-state.

Typically some of the arguments that were given were that the university is becoming dominated by market values instead of academic values; partnerships with industry are replacing the pact with the state that was forged in the modern period; science is fleeing the university and being conducted more and more outside the university in laboratories in major corporations. The assumptions behind these positions were that globalization was bringing about the end of the nation-state and that the university always rested on a universal form as defined by a particular understanding of modernity. Even in those accounts that did not use postmodern theories-such as the argument about "mode of knowledge production" and the rise of academic capitalism in general-a wide spectrum of writers announced the marginalization of the university.

Against these two scenarios my contention is that a sober look at the university in the longer perspective of history reveals a slightly different picture. The university today is indeed in transition but not in a terminal phase. The assessment in this chapter will be neither one of modernist self-confidence nor one of postmodern crisis. Globalization in fact offers the university the possibility of fulfilling what is perhaps its key role, namely, to provide institutional spaces where cognitive models for society to learn can emerge. In this respect the role of the university cannot be reduced to the specific forms that knowledge takes. Rather, it is the role of the university to connect these cognitive forms."

Under the sub-heading of "KNOWLEDGE AND THE UNIVERSITY", Delanty (243-244) explains what is a university? In his words:

"What is a university? The Latin *universitas* simply designated a defined group of people pursuing a collective goal and in that sense it suggested something communal. The term was not exclusively applied to universities and indeed many of the ancient universities-Plato's Academy or Aristotle's Lyceum-did not use the term. Universities emerged around the idea of governance, and the many forms of the university from the early middle ages on reflected the diversity of forms of governance, ranging from craft guilds to municipal corporations to state schools. In any case, underlying the university was the attempt to govern something called knowledge. But like the university, there is a diversity of forms of knowledge, making its governance increasingly elusive.

It is useful to begin by defining three kinds of knowledge. We can speak of knowledge as science, knowledge as action, and knowledge as cognition or reflection. Knowledge as science is the most obvious kind of knowledge. It refers to academic knowledge, the creation of new knowledge by scientific inquiry. In contrast to knowledge as science we also have knowledge as action, which might be more broadly called knowledge as doing or praxis. The history of Western thought has been deeply divided on whether this constitutes knowledge. Plato drew a sharp distinction between the high culture of

knowledge and the low culture of opinion and banished all forms of opinion from the world of the logos. This was the basis of all of the main forms of modernity. However, many of the oppositional currents in modernity drew on doxa, ranging from Aristotle's and Marx's *Homo faber*, that humanity makes itself in its own image by action, to contemporary views of the validity of common-sense, everyday, tacit, and local forms of knowledge. Thus, practical knowledge could be a form of pragmatic knowing, that is, knowing by doing. Today the demarcation of science from nonscience is becoming more and more difficult as a result of the growing availability and hence contestability of knowledge, the delegitimation of expertise, and the uncertainty of knowledge.

This suggests a third kind of knowledge, namely, knowledge as cognition. Knowledge is more than knowing in the theoretical and practical modes but is an essentially reflective process. This notion of knowledge is best captured by Hegel's idea of phenomenological knowledge, or in more contemporary terms, by the idea of reflexivity. Knowledge is a transformative and critical endeavor. Cognition pertains to a broader category of knowledge and consists of the capacity to create new things, ways of action, structures from the existing forms and ways of doing things. In this sense it is neither purely theoretical nor practical.

The argument made in this chapter is that it is the third kind of knowledge that the university is to develop. Clearly the first kind of knowledge, knowledge as science, is a central task of the university, but it is not the only one. The growing salience of knowledge as action does not exhaust the forms of knowledge. With this differentiated view of knowledge, some further distinctions can also be made with a view to a provisional definition of the university. In the university, four functions—research, teaching, training, and cultural transformation—are combined. These functions broadly correspond to the roles of researcher/scientist, teacher, trainer, and intellectual. The diversity of universities is a reflection of the numerous ways these functions are combined.

Looking at the extraordinary diversity of universities that have existed in history—from the ancient, medieval, and modern forms—we can say that the university is an institution that expresses these four functions in a variety of ways. In this respect, what is particularly interesting is how different cultures of knowledge are realized in the university. My thesis is that universities can be seen as a site of cognitive struggle whereby different cultures of knowledge have been formed and have entered into conflict with each other. In the brief sketch that follows I argue that there has been a progressive realization of knowledge as science, knowledge as praxis, and knowledge as cognition. In my view, virtuality, the current technological revolution, does not amount to something fundamentally new but is simply a new space in which old forms of knowledge can be expressed in new ways.

In their book, *Take Back Higher Education*, in a chapter entitled “Toward the Possibility of a Democratic Future”, Giroux and Giroux write about **Higher Education and the Crisis of the Social** (223). In this section they comment on functions of higher education. In their words:

There is a distinguished tradition of educational thought in the United States extending from Thomas Jefferson and W E. B. Du Bois to Jane Addams, John Dewey, and C. Wright Mills, in which the future of the university is premised on the recognition that in order for freedom to flourish in the public realm, citizens have to be educated for the task of self-government. Jane Addams and John Dewey, for example, argued that public and higher education should provide the conditions for people to involve themselves in the most pressing problems of society, to acquire the knowledge, skills, and ethical responsibility necessary for "reasoned participation in democratically organized publics."<sup>20</sup> C. Wright Mills challenged schooling as a form of corporate training and called for fashioning higher education within a public philosophy committed to a radical conception of citizenship, civic engagement, and public wisdom.<sup>21</sup> Education in this context was linked to public life through democratic values such as equality, justice, and freedom, rather than as an adjunct of the corporation, whose knowledge and values were defined largely through the prism of commercial interests. Education was crucial to individual agency and public citizenship, and integral to defending the relationship between an autonomous society-rooted in an ever-expanding process of self examination, critique, and reform-and autonomous individuals, for whom critical inquiry is propelled by the ongoing need to pursue ethics and justice as matters of social conscience and public good. In many ways, the academy has remained faithful, at least in theory, to a project of modern politics whose purpose was to create citizens capable of defining and implementing universal goals such as freedom, equality, and justice as part of a broader attempt to deepen the relationship between an expanded notion of the social and the enabling ground of a vibrant democracy. (224)

Giroux and Giroux continue:

"Higher education (as well as public education) cannot be viewed merely as a commercial investment or a private good based exclusively on career-oriented needs. Reducing higher education to the handmaiden of corporate culture works against the critical social imperative of educating citizens who can sustain and develop inclusive democratic public spheres. Lost in the merging of corporate culture and higher education is a historic and honorable democratic tradition that extends from John Adams to W E. B. Du Bois to John Dewey, one that we have mentioned repeatedly throughout this book, that extols the importance of education as essential for a democratic public life." Education within this tradition integrated knowledge and civic values necessary for independent thought and individual autonomy with the principles of social responsibility. Moreover, it cast a critical eye on the worst temptations of profit making and market-driven values. For example, Sheila Slaughter has argued persuasively that at the close of the nineteenth century, "professors made it clear that they did not want to be part of a cutthroat capitalism.... Instead, they tried to create a space between capital and labor where [they] could support a common intellectual project directed toward the public good." Amherst College President Alexander Meiklejohn echoed this sentiment in 1916 when he suggested:

*Insofar as a society is dominated by the attitudes of competitive business enterprise, freedom in its proper American meaning cannot be known, and*

***hence, cannot be taught. That is the basic reason why the schools and colleges, which are presumably commissioned to study and promote the ways of freedom, are so weak, so confused, so ineffectual."***<sup>20</sup> (254-255)

Giroux and Giroux further elaborate (284-285) by saying that:

**"Eric Gould argues that if the university is to provide a democratic education, it must "be an education for democracy... it must argue for its means as well as its ends... and participate in the democratic social process, displaying not only a moral preference for recognizing the rights of others and accepting them, too, but for encouraging argument and cultural critique." For Gould, higher education is a place for students to think critically and learn how to mediate between the imperatives of a "liberal democracy and the cultural contradictions of capitalism." We think the university can do this and more. How might higher education become not just a place to think, but also a space in which to learn how to connect thinking with doing, critical thought with civic courage, knowledge with socially responsible action, citizenship with the obligations of an inclusive democracy? Knowledge must become the basis for considering individual and collective action, and it must reach beyond the university to join with other forces and create new public spheres in order to deal with the immense problems posed by neoliberalism and all those violations of human rights that negate the most basic premises of freedom, equality, democracy, and social justice. Higher education is also one of the few spheres in which freedom and privilege provide the conditions of possibility for teachers and students to act as critical intellectuals and address the inhumane effects of power, forge new solidarities across borders, identities, and differences, and also raise questions about what a democracy might look like that is inclusive, radically cosmopolitan and suited to the demands of a global public sphere.<sup>104</sup>**

**Under such circumstances, the meaning and purpose of higher education redefines the relationship between knowledge and power, on the one hand, and learning and social change on the other. Higher education as a democratic public sphere offers the conditions for resisting depoliticization, provides a language to challenge the politics of accommodation that subjects education to the logic of privatization, refuses to define students as simply consuming subjects, and actively opposes the view of teaching as a market-driven practice and learning as a form of training. At stake is not simply the future of higher education, but the nature of existing modes of democracy and the promise of an unrealized democracy—a democracy that promises a different future, one that is filled with hope and mediated by the reality of democratic-based struggles.<sup>105</sup>**

### **What to Observe?**

The challenge of neo-liberal globalization is there and has to be faced creatively. But what should one first observe to say that one's academic institution is being transformed and becoming commercially oriented and getting away from performing its traditional democratic functions as discussed above by Delanty and Giroux. The material assembled below provides readers with descriptions of transformation of Australian universities and with reviews of many other studies. This material, I believe,

provides a good strategy for learning how to understand problems existing in academic institutions and in the everyday lives of people who work in those institutions, and who as researchers, intellectuals and cultural workers are looking for guidance on how to take practical actions.

Jan Currie (2004) in an article entitled "The Neo-liberal Paradigm and Higher Education" talks about Australian universities. In a sub-section in this article entitled "Transformation of Australian Universities" (54-58) she states the following:

**"Australia's higher education system became a deregulated and commercially oriented system within a decade of major reforms. A number of initiatives came into play from the mid-1980s through the 1990s, all working to privatize the costs of education.**

**In 1985 the Labor government ended the Overseas Student Program that provided aid to Third World students, and it permitted universities to charge full-cost fees to overseas students. This resulted in one of the largest increases in the proportion of international students studying in any country in the world. For example, in 1986 there were 20,000 aid students and 200 trade students from overseas. By 1991 there were 6,000 aid students and 48,000 trade students. From 1989 to 2000 the number of overseas fee-paying students quadrupled from 21,112 to 95,540.**

**In 1989 certain postgraduate courses were made liable to fees; in 1994 the restrictions surrounding these courses were almost entirely removed, effectively leaving postgraduate course work a fee-paying domain. Then from 1998 the Coalition (Liberal Party and Nation Party) government permitted universities to enroll a proportion of private Australian undergraduate students. Crucially, these measures were accompanied by falling levels of government support for individual students, with the amounts payable reduced and income tests tightened. Between 1984 and 1996 the proportion of students unable to obtain government support almost doubled, increasing from 35.1 percent to 61 percent.**

**According to Marginson (1997), as a result of such measures, proportion of higher education income contributed by students (through fees and other charges) rose "from 3 percent to over 24 percent in the decade following the Dawkins (Minister responsible for higher education) reforms, while the proportion coming from government sources (fell from 91 percent to 62 percent." Allied to this, public funding declined relative to the increase of student enrollments. Between 1989 and 1998, Marginson notes, "student enrollments increased by over 50 percent while the real value of operating funds per full-time student fell by around 15 percent." In the three years since 1998, government funding continued to fall so that it now represents approximately 50 percent of all funding for universities.**

**Marginson and Considine (2000) suggest that, due to these reform universities in Australia changed "more in the 1990s than in the previous 40 years." They also argue that "neo-liberal policies have been enforced with greater rigor in Australia than in the USA. Fiscal constraints have been tighter and competition reform has been harder." In line with this, many academics believe that intellectual traditions**

being forcibly displaced by market directives. Tony Coady (1996), professor of philosophy at Melbourne, writes about the threat that the r practices pose to "intellectual virtues such as honesty, intellectual courtesy, indifference to the mere fashion in ideas, and a dedication to regulative ideal of truth." Not only is there a loss of the humanities the critical role of professors, there is also a change in the working l of academics. An Australian study, *Unhealthy Paces of Learning*, found that the majority of staff worked above a forty-hour week and the average for full-time academic staff was 52.8 hours per week. Some 83 percent of all academics and 77 percent of general staff reported increases in workload since 1996, with a majority working in departments that have lost staff. In another national study of Australian academics, McInnis reports that the great majority of academics talked about loss of morale and the deterioration of overall duality and working condition.

Perhaps the most marked characteristic of the corporatized university is its downgrading of collegiality. As a result, success is individualized and highly tailored to the needs of the entrepreneurial institution. Another potential casualty of the corporatized university is academic freedom. It appears that cases restricting academic freedom are on the increase in Anglo-American universities and are taking different forms than half a century ago when loyalty oaths and one's political ideology, were more often questioned. The commercialization of research and partnerships with industry are limiting the public sharing of research findings. When academics try to publicize results unfavorable to industry sponsors or criticize the university itself, university managers do not always support the academics but act to silence them. In extreme cases, they have dismissed or suspended faculty from the university. Industry sponsors try to obtain confidentiality agreements in their contracts with universities, delay publication of research findings until patents are obtained, or secure other rights over the intellectual property.

An Australian report (Kayrooz et al., 2001) discusses the threat to academic freedom of the increasingly commercial environment in which universities work. This study asked if academics saw a deterioration of academic freedom due to commercialization. Ninety-two percent of respondents reported a degree of concern about the state of academic freedom in their university. Seventy-three percent of the sample thought that there had been deterioration in the state of academic freedom. Respondents sounded the warning that both industry and the university can interfere with academic freedom, industry on political and commercial grounds and the academy on ideological grounds. The study found some direct interference; for example, 17 percent said they were prevented from publishing contentious results. Also, almost half of the sample reported a reluctance to criticize institutions that provided them with large research grants. However, most respondents were concerned about the indirect impact of commercialization, which has produced substantial systemic effects on their experience of academic freedom, such as the intensification of work, the pressure to attract research funding from industry, the emphasis on fee-based courses, and the shift to more corporate management structures.

More specifically, academics commented on how the emphasis on fee-based courses was affecting academic standards, the shift in orientation to more

business-oriented courses, and concerns over intellectual property. Marginson notes a number of tensions within the current system.

In this context, the creation of a globalized international sector has led to fundamental tensions-tensions between the globalization of education and the fulfillment of local-national needs; tensions between international education and domestic education; tensions between commercial and noncommercial operations and objectives; and tensions between the private interests of universities, now redefined as self-managing corporations, and public goods. There has been a zero-sum trade-off between resources for teaching and for corporate development, and since 1995, a zero-sum trade-off between the increased participation of domestic undergraduates and the growth of foreign students.

This is just one instance of how the push toward the market can lead to a contortion of public universities. As governments ask universities to reduce their financial burden on society through privatization measures, individuals working in universities increasingly are being asked to "pay" for themselves and to account for how they spend taxpayers' money, whether on research, teaching, or other activities. The present writer investigated this process in three American and three Australian universities and found that legislators were interfering more in the lives of academics in both countries. Since 1991, the proportion of Australian government funding based on performance indicators has continued to rise for university research. Within institutions, parallel systems of distributing resources based on research are usually enforced and teaching performance indices are developed for internal university allocations. From the sample interviewed, it is evident that the respondents are experiencing increased accountability. The vast majority, slightly more than 85 percent in both Australian and American universities, said that accountability had increased, and no respondent reported that accountability had declined over the past five years.

In addition to the way academic activities are scrutinized, there is a perception that information is gathered without any clear vision of how it will be used. The emphasis on performance indicators and the increasing corporatization of universities have taken their toll on the service component of academics' work. Performance indicators are based on quantifiable measures and they usually measure what is easiest to count. This reduces the wide range of activities to a more narrow focus on publications of a certain type-international, refereed journal articles and books published by "respectable" academic publishers-and grants of a certain type, usually national competitive grants. Teaching and service to the community are generally dropped from these calculations as too difficult to assess.

Marginson and Considine (2000) identify five principal trends, which characterized Australian universities across the board in the mid-1990s, and summarize the managerialism implemented in many Anglo-American universities in the 1990s:



- **A new kind of executive power, including a will to manage and to manage according to "good practice."**
- **Structural changes, including the replacement of collegial forms of governance with senior executive groups, moving from more formal to semiformal types of power.**
- **A move to produce flexibility of personnel and resources, through industrial deregulation and the use of soft money and commercial companies outside of the main legislative rules of the university.**
- **A decline in the role of academic disciplines, as a result of new super deans or executive deans who control several disciplines and are often drawn from outside of academic disciplines.**
- **A pattern of devolution supporting centralized control and increased line management authority.**

**In the end, as Marginson (2001b) notes, there are limitations to the enterprise university. It has short-term goals and is little concerned with community interests. In sum,**

**It is not viable to use corporate self-interest to drive higher education's contribution to democratic culture, equality of social opportunity, or cultural diversity and cultural maintenance. Rather than maximizing all economic outputs, it maximizes short-term utilitarian outputs and private goods but weakens longer-term capacity and public goods.**

Jan Currie concludes by saying that:

**Despite all the potential dangers of enterprise universities, many still defend the move to privatize universities in Australia. Clive Hamilton (2001) identifies three vice-chancellors who have all contributed to the right-wing think tank of the Centre for Independent Studies and are the most forceful advocates of globalizing universities: Vice-Chancellors Lauchlan Chipman of Central Queensland University, Alan Gilbert of the University of Melbourne, and Steven Schwartz, formerly of VUurdoch University. Hamilton states:**

**These Visionaries argue that cuts in public funding and greater reliance on private finance have been good for universities as they have compelled them to become more internationally competitive. More deregulation and greater market-orientation are required, as this will put more power in the hands of education consumers where it properly resides.**

**He notes that "the most striking feature of the world of the Visionaries is the absence of any discussion of the contribution that universities can make to the**

cultural and social richness of a nation." Neo liberal globalization enshrines the market as a source of freedom. Not all vice-chancellors in Australia agree that competing in a free market environment is beneficial for universities. In a recent statement, even the generally conservative Australian Vice -Chancellors' Committee (AVCC:) argued against the market approach to higher education:

There is no example where the application of assumed pure market forces has brought a higher quality, more effective university system. A fully deregulated system exists nowhere. Local, national and international influences together with government intervention affect any market. There is no guarantee that a distorted market will produce the outcomes that are required in the national interest. The market is prone to failure.

Privatization is not always the answer to increasing freedom or creating a society based on the public good. If citizens are going to create healthier and wiser societies, there is a need to shore up public funding for universities and ensure that they continue to have the right to freedom of inquiry and persist in their role as "critic and conscience" of the nation. Also, if universities are going to be models of institutions for the general society, there is a need to shore up democratic collegiality against the rush to managerialize all aspects of decision making. Examples of faculty involvement in governance in the United States suggest that managerialism can be tempered with collegial government. Finally, adopting business practices may be prudent in some aspects of university management; however, there is a need for caution against picking the latest fad and applying it in the university culture. The need to maintain scholarly integrity, peer review, and professional autonomy is central to the legitimacy of universities and a move toward managerial mutability can be an attack on all three.

Jan Currie (44-68) talks about globalization and universities and makes many more points that one can use to observe the direction in which one's academic institution is moving and for guidance on how to take practical actions. In her words:

Most governments want universities to serve their national interests in the global marketplace and there is an increasing tendency to emphasize the practical and technical value of higher education. Students now look upon universities in an instrumental way to serve their individual, economic goals. One key economic element is to recognize that educational products can flow very easily across borders, creating a borderless higher education system. To take advantage of the fluidity of boundaries, universities, like transnational companies, are forming alliances to deliver education on a global scale, using Internet technology.

Governments in liberal market economies are also beginning the move to privatize universities, essentially by reducing public funding. However, privatization of higher education takes many forms. It includes allowing more private universities to be developed in a country, creating spin-off companies as part of public universities, establishing for-profit universities, and developing for-profit arms of public universities. It may mean a movement to a

user-pays system, where students pay increasing amounts for their university education when previously it was an entitlement with no fees or very small tuition costs. This has increasingly led to the corporatization of universities, or treating universities like businesses.

Are there benefits in this move to privatize and corporatize universities? And does neo-liberal globalization create new opportunities as well as potential disadvantages for universities? How are the tools of globalization, such as the Internet and e-mail, transforming universities?

#### **POTENTIAL BENEFITS**

- **Spread of access and opportunity**
- **Internationalization and increasing tolerance**
- **Increasing Links with Industry and Creating Greater Economic Growth**
- **More Efficient Operation**

#### **POTENTIAL DANGERS**

- **Increasing Inequality**
- **Skewing Education Toward The Market And Vocationalism**
- **Widening Of Inequalities**
- **Lowering Standards And Quality**

Regarding some of the micro-processes of globalization, such as the accountability movement, there are questions raised about its consequences as well. Birnbaum (2000) analyzes a number of management fads in higher education and why most fail to endure in universities. He quotes a number of studies that show that management fads usually do not deliver what they promise. Most are adopted from the business or government sector and then are diffused into higher education as quick-fix solutions. The quality assurance movement, including total quality management (TQM), benchmarking, performance-based budgeting, responsibility centered budgeting (RCB), performance-based appropriations (PBA), balanced scorecards (BSC), and management for results (MFR), were fads that started in the business sector, then were applied to education and seem to follow the cycle of "early enthusiasm, widespread dissemination, subsequent disappointment, and eventual decline."

University managers seek out these business practices to try to increase the efficiency of their organizations. Yet, many studies conclude that what is good for the world of business is not what is good for higher education institutions.

Applying the practice of quality assurance from the business world to universities may lead universities to adopt market rather than intellectual standards. Generally, academics do not see how quality audits will improve teaching and learning. Many assert that the reduction in funding has reduced quality and that quality procedures just add another layer of administration to their workloads without increasing quality. A former Australian vice-chancellor (O'Kane, 2001), writing before her resignation, concluded that quality in Australian universities had declined, citing these reasons:

- Staff are considerably busier, more stressed, and older than they were, on average fifteen or so years ago, and therefore have less time for informal contact with students.
- Class sizes are bigger and contact hours are sometimes lower. Students tend not to get the detailed guidance they got from tutors when groups were smaller.
- Many students are working part-time now, so that they have less time to devote to their studies.
- Staff have fewer opportunities to travel overseas, meaning that international contacts are in some ways weaker than they once were, increasing the isolation of the Australian system.
- Facilities are poorer.
- Fewer technical staff mean that laboratories are not maintained at the levels they were in the past.

O'Kane pointed to a widespread demoralization of staff leading to a decline in quality, which may not be a direct result of massification of the system. However, all of these factors together indicate that quality exercises are not likely to cure these ills.

- **Increased Managerialism And Secrecy Of Decision Making**

At a managerial level, universities are experiencing changes in the style, structure, and nomenclature of management directed toward more streamlined administration, greater control over spending, and more flexible staffing practices. In line with this, there are explicit attempts to move universities from collegial to executive decision making. The question may be posed whether globalization propelled this move toward managerialism or whether it would have occurred without the development of a global economy and its accompanying global practices. What is clear is that an increase in managerialism occurred simultaneously in a number of universities around the globe, leading to borrowing of practices from the world of business, seen as "best practices" and mainly derived from American businesses.

A number of commentators in Australia, the United States, and Canada observed this shift in power from academic departments to central administration. This change was accompanied by a new kind of fundamentalism suggesting that managers have all the answers and that answers to managerial issues are to be found in imitating business practices. Corporate managerialism assumes that managers should make the most important decisions and make them quickly, leading to restructured institutions whose streamlined operations give only a few people the information on which to base decisions. But of course this stands in direct opposition to assumptions regarding procedures of hiring and firing faculty, including tenure, and assumptions regarding the faculty control of curriculum, including programs.

In making these changes, management delineates which aspects of decision making academics can be involved in and which aspects the administration should control. Academics have never been central in allocating resources in the United States or Australia. Nevertheless, they sometimes have had a voice in various aspects of budget allocation and more control over academic policy, but even that role is declining. In Australian universities in the past decade, there has been a tendency to silence academics and other whistleblowers and to change the style of decision making to smaller groups making more secretive decisions. One of the reasons Australian University councils deliberate in secret is to enable them to discuss commercially sensitive information. They often exclude academic staff from their inner circles for fear of criticism of the commercial decisions taken.

- **Changing Nature Of Academic**

A number of writers have discussed the changing nature of academic work around the world. A Carnegie Foundation study on the academic profession in fourteen countries found a professoriate under strain, with expansion of higher education occurring at a time of diminishing resources. Academics in many of these countries reported pressures to be more entrepreneurial, to teach larger classes, to be evaluated more often by students, to survive on fewer research dollars and relatively lower salaries, and to be generally more productive. Also, many of the respondents were concerned about the more hierarchical, more rigid governance structure and expressed dissatisfaction with governance arrangements. Scholars around the world felt alienated from central administration, and fewer than 10 percent felt that they played a key role in governance at the institutional level. The present author interviewed 253 academics in Australia and the United States in the 1993-1995 period and found a high level of concern among academics that the enhanced accountability requirement associated with increasing managerialism and the restructuring of universities had produced a greater emphasis on entrepreneurialism that impinged on institutional autonomy and individual academic freedom. Several studies also found staff to be demoralized and dissatisfied with the increasing intensification of work.

- **Intensification Of Work**

Intensification of work is evident in most occupations as managers reduce staff and demand higher productivity. As in other professions, multiskilling is now the order of the day as most knowledge workers have to extend their skills to learn new software programs and become computer literate at a fairly sophisticated level. For academics, this includes the skills to deliver and teach courses online. Brabazon (2001) concludes that Internet-based teaching actually increases academic workloads because "*somebody* needs to design the content and layout. *Somebody* needs to write the Web pages. *Somebody* needs to ensure that hypertext links are up-to-date. *Somebody* needs to create evaluative criteria. *Somebody* needs to administer the students' results." Moreover, she suggests that current Internet teaching is not relieving academics staff of face-to-face teaching but it is a time-consuming addition to very full working days. And e-mail messages add yet more work. "Hour-long) blocks must be set aside to read and reply to an ever-increasing stream) of professional, academic, research and teaching inquiries" (Brabazon, 2001).

The cost of online and distance education is another concern) because it takes money away from face-to-face teaching. Even though universities may have generated more revenue due to fees from overseas students, industry grants, and consultancies, the increased revenue has not gone toward teaching but toward other costs, including higher salaries for managers, offshore recruitment, and marketing. Therefore, student-staff ratios continue to climb and teaching becomes more stress<sup>11</sup> as academics have to teach more students, in more modes, be available 24/7 due to e-mail, fax, and phone access, and do more of their own secretarial work and marketing of their courses.

- **Regimentation And Loss Of Collegiality**

A number of factors have contributed to the fragmentation of academic staff. The increased use of e-mail to communicate has meant that staff offices right next to each other send e-mails rather than talk face to face about an issue. Of course, this is more efficient, yet the loss of human contact takes its toll. Another major factor contributing to the fragmentation of the notion of a community of scholars is the ideology competition. The competitive neutrality principle has exacted its toll making academics compete with one another as though they are on a level playing field. However, this level playing field never exists in reality. Universities are differentiated by history, age, reputation, location, size, types of courses offered, and so on. Departments are equally differentiated by similar factors. And academics by their very location in certain departments, in certain universities, are almost never on an equal playing field. Yet, the notions that the market knows best and that competition brings greater efficiency and that the competition must be based on a neutral stage has meant that formulas that do not differentiate among various types of institutions, departments, or academics are used to set performance indicators and distribute resources. This competitive ethos pits one academic against another, one department against another, and one university against another.

This leads to a game of individuals in the survival of the fittest that fragments the university.

- **Loss Of Traditional Values**

What are some of the traditional values lost in the new enterprise universities? How have market forces changed our conception of a university? Four key traditional values of universities may be lost in the rush to privatize, commercialize, and create enterprise universities: the public interest value of universities, critical dissent and academic freedom, professional autonomy and scholarly integrity, and democratic collegiality. t111 of these overlap in some way to help produce students who will become the educated citizens of tomorrow with a social conscience and a desire to see a more just and democratic world.

Singh (2001) identifies a range of social purposes that can yield public benefits, including the facilitation of social justice and the ability of higher education to function as "critic and conscience of society." As Singh points out, "the social purposes of higher education are losing their resonance in the rush to make universities accountable within the logic of the market."

Commercialization, as noted above, is having an impact on academic freedom, often seen as a key legitimating function of the university. When this principle is in good health, academics are given the freedom to teach with passion and introduce controversial ideas that will challenge students to be more critically thinking citizens. Collier (2001) asks: "If the market is the measure of all things, and if only the 'fittest' institutions *and individuals* are likely to survive, where does such an economic rationalist discourse leave the 'inquiring soul' of the academic?"

An established principle, in fact a truism, is that the integrity of a university depends on the integrity of its scholars. This integrity, in its turn, depends upon honesty in scholarship and developing consistently high standards in assessing one another's work. It is important for academics to exercise independent judgment where there is no self-interest involved. Scholarly inquiry should be open-minded, and not influenced by any particular interests that are served by the results. Without the integrity of researchers and a certain amount of objectivity, what becomes of scholarship and a university's service to the public in producing knowledge based on the public interest?

Lastly, to produce both educated and active citizens, universities need to develop and maintain a culture of democratic collegiality. Managerialism, however, leads to just the opposite, as noted above. Are any of the values still visible within Australian and North American universities? To what extent has the transformation of universities into enterprise universities crushed these traditional values and what kinds of universities have been created? With the acceleration of work and its intensification, along with the pressures to garner funds from industry and wealthy individuals, enterprise universities are making it very difficult for academics to hold on to these traditional values.

Now we turn to work by Henry Giroux and Susan Giroux for guidance on what to observe and how to take practical actions within academic institutions. In their book *Take Back Higher Education* (272-285), they state that (274-275):

**Neoliberalism's obsession with spreading the gospel of the market and the values of corporate culture has utterly transformed the nature of educational leadership, the purpose of higher education, the work relations of faculty, the nature of what counts as legitimate knowledge, and the quality of pedagogy itself. It has also restructured those spaces and places in which students spend a great deal of time outside of classrooms. Increasingly, corporations are joining up with universities to privatize a seemingly endless array of services that universities once handled by them selves. University bookstores are now run by corporate conglomerates such as Barnes & Noble, while companies such as Sodexo-Marriott (also a large investor in the U.S. private prison industry) run a large percentage of college dining halls, and McDonald's and Starbucks occupy prominent locations on the student commons. Student identification cards are now adorned with MasterCard and Visa logos, providing them with an instant line of credit. In addition, housing, alumni relations, health care, and a vast range of other services are now being leased out to private firms to manage and run. One consequence is that spaces once marked as public and noncommodified - spaces for quiet study or student gatherings - now have the appearance of a shopping mall. As David Trend points out:**

*student union buildings and cafeterias took on the appearance-or were conceptualized from the beginning-as shopping malls or food courts, as vendors competed to place university logos on caps, mugs, and credit cards. This is a larger pattern in what has been termed the "Disneyfication" of college life. . . . a pervasive impulse toward infotainment . . . where learning is "fun," the staff "perky," where consumer considerations dictate the curriculum, where presentation takes precedence over substance, and where students become "consumers." 82*

Commercial logos, billboards, and advertisements now plaster the walls of student centers, dining halls, cafeterias, and bookstores. Everywhere students turn outside of the university classroom, they are confronted with vendors and commercial sponsors who are hawking credit cards, athletic goods, soft drinks, and other commodities that one associates with the local shopping mall. Universities and colleges compound this marriage of commercial and educational values by signing exclusive contracts with Pepsi, Nike, Starbucks, and other contractors, further blurring the distinction between student and consumer. The message to students is clear: customer satisfaction is offered as a surrogate for learning, "to be a citizen is to be a consumer, and nothing more. Freedom means freedom to purchase."<sup>83</sup> But colleges and universities do not simply produce knowledge and values for student, they also play an influential role in shaping their identities. If colleges and universities are to define themselves as centers of teaching and learning vital to the democratic life of the nation, they must acknowledge the real danger of becoming mere adjuncts to big business, or corporate entities in themselves. At the very least,



**this demands that university administrators, academics, students, and others exercise the political, civic, and ethical courage needed to refuse the commercial rewards that would reduce them to simply another brand name or corporate logo.**

Giroux and Giroux point out that as globalization penetrates deeper into academic institutions certain professions will be affected (272). In their words one can observe the following things happening:

**As globalization and corporate mergers increase, new technologies develop, and cost-effective practices expand, there will be fewer jobs for certain professionals-resulting in the inevitable elevation of admission standards, restriction of student loans, and the reduction of student access to higher education, particularly for those groups who are marginalized because of their class and race.<sup>72</sup> Fewer jobs in higher education means fewer students will be enrolled, but it also means that the processes of vocationalization---fueled by corporate values that mimic "flexibility," "competition," or "lean production" and rationalized through the application of accounting principles threaten to gut many academic departments and programs that cannot translate their subject matter into commercial gains. Programs and courses that focus on areas such as critical theory, literature, feminism, ethics, environmentalism, postcolonialism, philosophy, and sociology involve an intellectual cosmopolitanism or a concern with social issues that will be either eliminated or cut back because their role in the market will be judged as ornamental, or in the post 9/11 era, "unpatriotic," as we discussed in chapter 1. Similarly, those working conditions that allow professors and graduate assistants to comment extensively on student work, provide small seminars, spend time with student advising, conduct independent studies, and do collaborative research with both faculty colleagues and students do not appear consistent with the imperatives of downsizing, efficiency, and cost accounting.<sup>73</sup>**

And they say that students will be affected in certain ways:

**Students will also be affected adversely by the growing collaboration between higher education and the corporate banking world. As all levels of government reduce their funding to higher education, not only will tuition increase, but loans will increasingly replace grants and scholarships. Lacking adequate financial aid, students, especially poor students, will have to finance the high costs of their education through private corporations such as Citibank, Chase Manhattan, Marine Midland, and other lenders.**

And (273) they state:

**Of course, for many young people caught in the margins of poverty, low-paying jobs, recession, and "jobless recovery," the potential costs of higher education, regardless of its status or availability, will dissuade them from even thinking about attending college. Unfortunately, as state and federal agencies and university systems direct more and more of their resources (such as state tax credits and scholarship programs) toward middle- and upper income students and away from need-based aid, the growing gap in college**

enrollments between high-income students (95 percent enrollment rate) and low-income students (75 percent enrollment rate) with comparable academic abilities will widen even further.<sup>76</sup>----

And, they (273-274) continue:

Those students who enter higher education will often find themselves in courses being taught by an increasing army of part time and adjunct faculty. Given personnel costs- "of which salaries and benefits for tenured faculty... typically account for 90 percent of operating budgets"<sup>79</sup> -university administrators are hiring more part-time faculty and depleting the ranks of tenured faculty. Applying rules taken directly from the cost-effective, downsizing strategies of industry, universities continuously attempt to cut budgets, maximize their efficiency, and reduce the power of the professorate by keeping salaries as low as possible, substituting part-time teaching positions for full-time posts, chipping away at or eliminating employee benefits, and threatening to restructure or eliminate tenure. Not only do such policies demoralize the fulltime faculty, exploit part-time workers, and overwork teaching assistants-they also cheat students. Too many undergraduates find themselves in oversized classes taught by faculty who are overburdened by heavy teaching loads. Understandably, such faculty have little loyalty to the departments or universities in which they teach, rarely have the time to work collaboratively with other faculty or students, have almost no control over what they teach, and barely have the time to do the writing and research necessary to keep up with their fields of study. The result often demeans teachers' roles as intellectuals, proletarianizes their labor, and shortchanges the quality of education that students deserve.<sup>80</sup>

What should one observe in the area of cost effectiveness? According to Giroux and Giroux (268-269):

In fact, when business concerns about efficiency and cost effectiveness replace the imperatives of critical learning, a division based on social class begins to appear. Poor and marginalized students will get low-cost, low-skilled knowledge and second-rate degrees from on-line sources, while those students being educated for leadership positions in the elite schools will get personalized instruction and socially interactive pedagogies in which high-powered knowledge, critical thinking, and problem-solving will be a priority (coupled with a high-status degree). Under such circumstances, traditional modes of class and racial tracking will be reinforced and updated in what David Noble calls "digital diploma mills."<sup>61</sup> Noble underemphasizes, in his otherwise excellent analysis, indications that the drive toward corporatizing the university will take its biggest toll on those second- and third-tier institutions that are increasingly defined as serving no other function than to train semi-skilled and obedient workers for the new postindustrial order. The role slotted for these institutions is driven less by the imperatives of the new digital technologies than by the need to reproduce a gender, racial, and class division of labor that supports the neoliberal global market revolution and its relentless search for bigger profits.

Held up to the profit standard, universities and colleges will increasingly calibrate supply to demand, and the results look ominous with regard to what forms of knowledge, pedagogy, and research will be rewarded and legitimated. As colleges and corporations collaborate over the content of degree programs, particularly with regard to on-line graduate degree programs, college curricula run the risk of being narrowly tailored to the needs of specific businesses.

Further one needs to observe changes taking place in the area of issues related to intellectual. Giroux and Giroux say (270-272) that:

**On-line courses also raise important issues about intellectual property—who owns the rights for course materials developed for on-line use. Because of the market potential of on-line lectures and course materials, various universities have attempted to lay ownership claims to such knowledge. ....Julia Porter Liebeskind, a professor at the Marshall School of Business, points to three specific areas of concern that are worth mentioning.**

**First, the growth of patenting by universities has provided a strong incentive "for researchers to pursue commercial projects," especially in light of the large profits that can be made by faculty.<sup>67</sup>----**

**Second, patenting agreements can place undue restraints on faculty, especially with respect to keeping their research secret and delaying publications, or even prohibiting "publication of research altogether if it is found to have commercial value."<sup>68</sup> Such secrecy undermines faculty collegiality and limits a faculty member's willingness to work with others; it also damages faculty careers and prevents significant research from becoming part of the public intellectual commons. Derek Bok concisely sums up some of the unfortunate consequences, particularly in the sciences, that plague higher education's complicity with the corporate demand for secrecy:**

*It disrupts collegial relationships when professors cannot talk freely to other members of their department. It erodes trust, as members of scientific conferences wonder whether other participants are holding information for commercial reasons. It promotes waste as scientists needlessly duplicate work that other investigators have already performed in secret for business reasons. Worst of all, secrecy may retard the course of science itself, since progress depends upon every researcher being able to build upon the findings of others, investigators.<sup>69</sup>*

**Finally, the ongoing commercialization of research puts undue pressure on faculty to pursue research that can raise revenue and poses a threat to faculty intellectual property rights.....**

**As universities make more and more claims on owning the content of faculty notes, lectures, books, computer files, and media for classroom use, the first casualty is, as Ed Condren, a UCLA professor points out, "the legal protection that enables faculty to freely express their views without fear of censorship or appropriation of their ideas."<sup>71</sup> At the same time, by selling course property**

rights for a fee, universities infringe on the ownership rights of faculty members by removing them from any control over how their courses might be used in the public domain.

How is leadership in academic units changing under corporate culture? What should one observe? Giroux and Giroux point out (231-232):

**Leadership under the reign of corporate culture and corporate time has been reconceived as a form of homage to business models of governance. As Stanley Aronowitz points out, "Today ... leaders of higher education wear the badge of corporate servants proudly."<sup>44</sup> Gone are the days when university presidents were hired for intellectual status and public roles. College presidents are now labeled as Chief Executive Officers, and are employed primarily because of their fundraising abilities. Deans of various colleges are often pulled from the ranks of the business world and pride themselves on the managerial logic and cost-cutting plans they adopt from the corporate culture of Microsoft, Disney, and IBM. Bill Gates, the CEO of Microsoft, and Michael Eisner, the CEO of Disney, replace John Dewey and Robert Hutchins as models of educational leadership. Rather than defend the public role of the university, academic freedom, and worthy social causes, the new corporate heroes of higher education now focus their time and energies on selling off university services to private contractors, forming partnerships with local corporations, searching for new patent and licensing agreements, and urging faculty to engage in research and grants that generate external funds. Under this model of leadership the university is being transformed from a place to think to a place to imagine stock options and profit windfalls.**

There is a difference between the notions of leadership and management. What should one observe in this area? Giroux and Giroux suggest (259):

**As corporate culture and values shape university life, corporate planning replaces social planning, management becomes a substitute for leadership, and the private domain of individual achievement replaces the discourse of participatory politics and social responsibility. While it is difficult to predict what the eventual consequences might be, Derek Bok argues that university leaders have not paid enough attention to this trend. He predicts that if the commercialization of higher education is not brought under control, the institution could end up cheapened and trivialized. He writes:**

***One can imagine a university of the future tenuring professors because they bring in large amounts of patent royalties and industrial funding; paying high salaries to recruit "celebrity" scholars who can attract favorable media coverage; admitting less than fully qualified students in return for handsome parent gifts; soliciting corporate advertising to underwrite popular executive programs; promoting Internet courses of inferior quality while canceling worthy conventional offerings because they cannot cover their costs; encouraging professors to spend more time delivering routine services to attract corporate clients, while providing a variety of symposia and "academic"***

***conferences planned by marketing experts in their development offices to lure potential donors to campus.*<sup>35</sup>**

Changes are taking place in the area of faculty relationships as corporate culture re-defines the notion of time. What should one observe about time in academic units? Giroux and Giroux (232-233) explain:

**Corporate time provides a new framing mechanism for faculty relations and modes of production and suggests a basic shift in the role of the intellectual. Academics now become less important as a resource to provide students with the knowledge and skills they need to engage the future as a condition of democratic possibilities. In the "new economy," they are entrepreneurs who view the future as an investment opportunity and research as a strategic career move rather than as a civic and collective effort to improve the public good. Increasingly, academics find themselves being de-skilled as they are pressured to teach more service-oriented and market-based courses and devote less time to their roles either as well-informed public intellectuals or as "cosmopolitan intellectuals situated in the public sphere."<sup>45</sup>**

**Corporate time not only transforms the university as a democratic public sphere into a space for training while defining faculty as entrepreneurs; it also views students as customers, potential workers, and as a source of revenue. As customers, students "are conceptualized in terms of their ability to pay. . . . and the more valued customers are those who can afford to pay more."<sup>41</sup> One consequence, as Gary Rhoades points out, is that student access to higher education is "now shaped less by considerations of social justice than of revenue potential."<sup>47</sup> Consequently, those students who are poor and under-served are increasingly denied access to the benefits of higher education. Of course, the real problem, as Gary Nelson observes, is not merely one of potential decline, but "long term and continuing failure to offer all citizens, especially minorities of class and color, equal educational opportunities, "<sup>48</sup> a failure that has been intensified under the corporate university. As a source of revenue, students are now subjected to higher fees and tuition costs, and are bombarded by brand-name corporations who either lease space on the university commons to advertise their goods or run any one of a number of student services, from the dining halls to the university bookstore. Almost every aspect of public space in higher education is now designed to attract students as consumers and shoppers, constantly subjecting them to forms of advertising mediated by the rhythms of corporate time, which keeps students moving through a marketplace of logos rather than ideas. Such hyper-commercialized spaces increasingly resemble malls, transforming all available university space into advertising billboards and bringing home the message that the most important identity available to students is that of the consuming subject. As the line between public and commercial space disappears, the gravitational pull of Taco Bell, McDonald's, Starbucks, Barnes and Noble, American Express, and Nike, among others, creates a "geography of nowhere,"<sup>49</sup> a consumer placelessness in which all barriers between a culture of critical ideas and branded products simply disappear."<sup>50</sup> Education is no longer merely a monetary exchange in which students buy an upscale, lucrative career, it is also an experience designed to**

evacuate any broader, more democratic notion of citizenship, the social, and the future that students may wish to imagine, struggle over, and enter. In corporate time, students are disenfranchised "as future citizens and reconstitute[d] ... as no more than consumers and potential workers."<sup>51</sup>

And what is the value of knowledge under corporate time? What to observe for guidance on how to take practical actions? Giroux and Giroux further elaborate (233-234):

**Corporate time not only translates faculty as multinational operatives and students as sources of revenue and captive consumers; it also makes a claim on how knowledge is valued, how the classroom is organized, and how pedagogy is defined. Knowledge under corporate time is valued as a form of capital. As Michael Peters observes, entire disciplines and bodies of knowledge are now either valued on the basis of their "ability to attract global capital ...potential for serving transnational corporations. Knowledge is valued for its strict utility rather than as an end in itself or for its emancipatory effects."<sup>52</sup> Good value for students means taking courses labeled as "relevant" in market terms, which are often counterposed to courses in the social sciences, humanities, and the fine arts, which are concerned with forms of learning that do not readily translate into either private gains or commercial value.**

### **A Larger Perspective**

Giroux and Giroux say that:

**We are not suggesting that market institutions and investments cannot at times serve public interests, but rather that in the absence of vibrant, democratic public spheres, unchecked corporate power respects few boundaries based on self-restraint and the greater public good, and is increasingly unresponsive to those broader human values that are central to a democratic civic culture. We believe that at this point in American history, neoliberal capitalism is not simply too overpowering, but also that "democracy is too weak."<sup>16</sup> Hence, we witness the increasing influence of money over politics, corporate interests overriding public concerns, and the growing tyranny of unrestrained corporate power and avarice refashioning education at all levels. The economist Paul Krugman recently described a cultural revolution of values afoot in American life equal to that of the sexual revolution—one that reflects a neoDarwinian ethic that shows no concern for the widening of already vast inequalities between rich and poor, black and white. (*Take Back Higher Education*, p. 254)**

And Delanty says that:

**Against these two scenarios my contention is that a sober look at the university in the longer perspective of history reveals a slightly different picture. The university today is indeed in transition but not in a terminal phase. The assessment in this chapter will be neither one of modernist self-**

confidence nor one of postmodern crisis. Globalization in fact offers the university the possibility of fulfilling what is perhaps its key role, namely, to provide institutional spaces where cognitive models for society to learn can emerge. In this respect the role of the university cannot be reduced to the specific forms that knowledge takes. Rather, it is the role of the university to connect these cognitive forms.

### References Cited

- Aboulafia, Mitchell (1986). *Philosophy, social theory, and the thoughts of George Herbert Mead*. The MIT Press.
- Aboulafia, Mitchell (2001). *The cosmopolitan self: George Herbert Mead and continental philosophy*. Champaign, Ill: the University of Illinois Press.
- Aboulafia, Mitchell, Brookman, Mary & Kemp, Catherine (2002/2004). *Habermas and pragmatism*. Routledge.
- Barlow, Maud and Robertson, Heather-Jane (1994). *Class warfare: the assault on Canada's schools?*
- Barlow, Maud and Robertson, Heather-Jane (1994). *Class warfare: the assault on Canada's schools?*
- Berliner, David (1996). *The manufactured crisis: myths, Fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Basic Books, 2nd. Edition.
- Burnafor, Gail et. al. (Ed) (2001). *Teachers doing research: the power of action through inquiry*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Campbell, Marie & Gregor, Frances (2004). *Mapping social relations: a primer in doing institutional ethnography*. AtaMira Press.
- Cherryholmes, Cleo (1988). *Rethinking Education*. Teachers College Publishers.
- Denzin, Norman K. (1992). *Symbolic interactionism and cultural studies*. Blackwell Publication.
- Kaufman, C. (2003). *Ideas for actions: relevant theory for radical change*. Cambridge, Mss.: South End Press.
- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Odin, S. (1996). *The social self in Zen and American pragmatism*. Albany; State University of New York Press.
- Ritzer, George (1994/2004). *The McDnaldization of society*. Pine Forge Press.

Robertson, Heather-Jane (2007). "Public education in corporate-dominated culture",

\_\_\_\_\_ (1999). No more teachers, no more books: the commercialization of Canada's schools. Tundra Press.

Singh, Amarjit (1997). Under the title of *Society, Culture and Schooling: Issues and Analysis*, edited by Amarjit Singh & Ishmael Baksh.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2001). *Teacher training: a reflective practice*. Kaniksh Publishers.

Smith, Dorothy (2005). *Institutional ethnography: a sociology for people*. The AltaMira Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1991). *Institutional Ethnography as practice*. Rowman and Littlefield.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1990a). *The conceptual practices of power: a feminist sociology of knowledge*. Northeastern.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1990b). *Text, facts, and femininity: exploring the relations of ruling*.

\_\_\_\_\_ (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: a feminist sociology*.

Springer Netherland, a book chapter in, *International Handbook of Educational Change*.

*The Morning Watch: Educational and Social Analysis*. A Journal Published Bi-Annually in Faculty of Education, Memorial University, Newfoundland, Canada A1B 3X8. See the Special Issue: *The Morning Watch Book*, Winter 2006, Vol. 33 - Fall 2007, Vol. 35; Baksh, I.J. and Singh, A. (Ed.) (1991). *Dimensions of Newfoundland Society and Education*, Vol.1; Baksh, I.J., Hache, G. and Singh, A. (2000). *Studies in Newfoundland Society and Culture*. Vol. 3. <http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/nmwatch.htm> <[Multiple Perspectives on Education and Society in Newfoundland and Labrador \(2007\)](#)>, edited by Amarjit Singh, Ishmael Baksh, George Hache, Joan Oldford with Amy Chistlett. (Available only in electronic PDF version and on disk in Memorial University Libraries). ISBN 978-0-88901-291-9.



## Other References

- Brah, Avtar (1997/1996). *Cartographies of diaspora contesting identities*. Routledge.
- Brah, Avtar and Coombes, Annie E. (Ed.) (2000). *Hybridity and its discontents politics science culture*. Routledge.
- Crosby, Michael (2008). *Paradox of power from control to compassion*. The Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Farmbry, Kyle (2009). *Administration and the other explorations of diversity and marginalization in the political administrative state*. Lexinton Books.
- Ferrer, Jorge N. and Sherman, Jacob H. (2008). *Participatory turn spirituality mysticism religious studies*. State University of New York Press.
- Fujikane, Candance and Okamura, Jonathan Y. (Ed.) (2008). *Asian settler colonialism: from local governance to the habits of everyday life in Hawai'i*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Galbraith, James K. (2008). *The predator state: how conservatives abandoned the free market and why liberal should too*. Free Press.
- Hussein, Abdirahman A. (2002). *Edward Said criticism and society*. Verso.
- Keown, Michelle, Murphy, David & Procter, James (2009). *Comparing postcolonial diasporas*. Palgrave Macmillian.
- Meszaros, Istvan foreword by Foster, John Bellamy (2008). *Challenge and burden of historical time socialism in the twenty-first century*. Monthly Review Press.
- Raj, Dhooleka S. (2003). *Where are you from middle-class migrants in the modern world*. University of California Press.
- Schuler, Douglas (2008). *Liberating voices a pattern language for communication revolution*. The MIT Press.
- Sharma, Sanjay (2006). *Multicultural encounters*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- West, Thomas R. (2002). *Signs of struggle the rhetorical politics of cultural difference*. State University New York Press.