

# GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Jaishree K. Odin and Peter T. Manicas, Editors

(Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004)

Available from Amazon.com \$27.00 (Pb)

## CONTENTS

### Foreward

*Deane Neubauer*, Vice-President for Academic Affairs  
University of Hawai'i at Manoa viii

**Acknowledgements** x

### Introduction

*Peter T. Manicas and Jaishree K. Odin* xi

### *Part I The Larger Context*

Introduction 3

Chapter 1 "Globalization and Higher Education"  
*Peter Wagner* 6

Chapter 2 "The Withering Away of the Professoriate  
Corporate Universities and the Internet"  
*Michael Margolis* 19

Chapter 3 "The Neo-Liberal Paradigm and Higher Education:  
A Critique"  
*Jan Currie* 35

### *Part II A Closer Look*

Introduction 54

Chapter 4 "Globalization, Higher Education and Markets"  
*Charles Smith* 56

Chapter 5 "Lessons from the For-Profit Side"  
*Richard S. Ruch* 68

Chapter 6 “College Participation and Socioeconomic Mobility” <i>Scott Thomas</i>	86
 <b><i>Part III Implications for Pedagogy and the Curriculum</i></b>	
Introduction	99
Chapter 7 “The Erosion of Face-to-Face Pedagogy: A Jeremiad” <i>John J. McDermott</i>	104
Chapter 8 “The Used Car Dealership and the Church: On Resolving the Identity of the University” <i>Charles Karelis</i>	111
Chapter 9 “New Technologies and the Reconstitution of the University” <i>Jaishree K. Odin</i>	116
 <b><i>Part IV Regional Responses to Globalization</i></b>	
Introduction	130
Chapter 10 “Globalization and the Consequences for Higher Education in China” <i>Su Hao</i>	132
Chapter 11 “Knowledge and Higher Education in Latin America: Incommodious Commodities?” <i>Leonardo Garnier</i>	144
Chapter 12 “Corporate, Technological, Epistemic and Democratic Challenges” <i>Sohail Inayatullah</i>	160
 <b><i>Part V The Future of Higher Education</i></b>	
Introduction	174
Chapter 13 “The Changing Nature of Higher Education: A Story of the Self Re-Organizing University” <i>Tom P. Abeles</i>	177
Chapter 14 “Does the University Have a Future?” <i>Gerard Delanty</i>	192

## Introduction

*Peter T. Manicas and Jaishree K. Odin*

The present volume had its genesis in a conference, entitled “Globalization and Higher Education,” held in Honolulu in February 2002, and sponsored by the Globalization Research Center at the University of Hawai’i at Manoa. There were a number of novelties to this conference which bear on the contents of the volume. We think that these novelties make this a very different and important kind of book. Of course, readers will determine how different and how important.

First, there was a very deliberative effort to bring together for three intense days people who would offer very different perspectives on the nest of problems generated by joining the already complex ideas of “globalization” and “higher education.” The authors of the essays in the present volume do indeed come from very different places, both in terms of geographical location (Australia, Britain, China, Costa Rica, Germany, Hong Kong, Kashmir, Pakistan, and the United States) and in terms of their institutional positions in higher education, as either active players or as scholars or both. Thus, we invited not only academics from several disciplines, but entrepreneurs, folks who had served as Deans in several very different kinds of institutions of higher education, and a past President of a prominent eastern University. (See Notes on Contributors.) These many different voices give this volume an inclusiveness and comprehensiveness not attempted before.

The second novelty was that the conference would be “dialogic.” With the particular angle of vision of each participant in mind, the organizer asked the participants to speak from their position to issues that had been the primary area of concern and expertise, but not to present a paper. Instead, they would offer the group their reflections on how they saw things. This would be followed by moderated conversation—a dialogue. This gave us ample opportunity to explore issues, to raise questions, to offer dissent, to learn. It was not long before we had congealed a kind of a community. Given the chance to understand one another, we were forced to rethink things, perhaps even to change our minds. This gives the volume an integrity which, given the very different orientations of the participants, would not otherwise have been possible.

There was also a danger in this process: it wasn’t easy to stay on track. We knew at the outset that the problems were inter-connected, but did not appreciate how profoundly inter-connected they were. Indeed, not only are both the leading concepts, “globalization” and “higher education” complex, but trying to identify the causes and connections between them was forbidding, contestable and conjectural. The essays in this volume give ample evidence of this.

We also decided that after we had all dispersed across the globe to our home bases, we would keep the conversation going asynchronously. A web-site was established for electronic conferencing. Not everyone was equally comfortable with this mode of

conversation. That was to be expected. But even our Danforth Award teacher and powerful defender of face-to-face teaching and learning, made his appearance!

Despite the variant perspectives, we found a common discourse. Indeed, gradually, there emerged some considerable consensus on a number of key ideas. To be sure, there were some very wide disagreements, especially as regards *explaining* what we could agree to, and partly as a consequence of these disagreements, there were disagreements about alternative versions of the future of the higher education.

For convenience, we offer some of the consensus ideas, beginning with some hard lessons learned during the course of our conversation (but not always noticed by standard accounts).

We had no trouble agreeing that post-secondary education is now a massive globalizing industry and it is perhaps impossible to overestimate the potential. The potential in Asia alone is fantastic. It is projected that by 2010 there will be 100 million people in the world, all fully qualified to proceed from secondary to tertiary education, but there will be no room left on any campus. A recent study by Merrill Lynch reported that the higher-education market outside the US is worth \$111 billion annually with perhaps 32 million potential students (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 6/8/2002). To be sure, this raises more questions than it answers, especially regarding the possible consequences for future of higher education.

The presence of participants from so many different locations forced us to see that there is a huge risk of over-generalization when we speak of higher education. First, even if one restricts one's sight to higher education in the US, it is an error to think of "higher education" in terms of the University of Michigan or Ohio Wesleyan. This overlooks the huge differences in the character and goals of the institutions of higher education: public/private, Research I Universities/Liberal Arts colleges, four-year colleges/Community colleges, non-profit/for profit, proprietary schools (which offer training in trades and regulated industries, e.g., auto-mechanics, tourism) online universities, corporate universities (e.g., Sun Microsystems University, the University of Toyota) and finally, "diploma mills," digital and otherwise (Ruch, Thomas, Delanty, Wagner).

Worse, it is easy to slip into the assumption—not always noticed, even by participants in a conference on globalization—that arrangements in higher education globally are pretty much the same as arrangements to be found in the United States. This is anything but the case. Differences in the histories and political economies of the nations of the world have resulted in differences in the situation of higher education across the globe. (See especially essays by Wagner, Currie, Inayatullah, Su Hao, Garnier, and Delanty). This regards not only questions of access, funding, organization, programs and institutional variety, but questions of needs and goals as well.

To take but one important example, there are remarkable disparities in the sources

of funding globally for institutions of higher education. Although the situation is made especially complex by differences in institutions and recent figures are difficult to come by, European institutions of higher education still get the majority of support, as much as 90%, from public funds. (Slaughter, 1997). In the US, State support peaked in 1979 at 62 % and has declined steadily ever since. At the beginning of its most recent spiral, in 1991, it was 40%. "We used to be state-supported, then we became state-assisted, and now we are state-located." Other chief executive officers talk about leading "privately financed public universities." Currently, in the US, both private and public institutions draw the majority of their support from non-state sources, including tuitions, research grants, and gifts (Duderstadt, 2000). On the other hand, there is evidence that the trends clearly visible in the US toward "privatization" are visible elsewhere as well. Thus Garnier (below) argues that in 1930, private universities accounted for but 3% of enrollment in Latin America; today, they might account for almost half. As he notes, this is particularly troubling given the explosion of "garage universities"--charging high tariffs and offering very low quality programs.

But given differences in the situations of American, European, Latin American, Australian and Asian Colleges and Universities (with differences among these as well), the "public" university is currently the dominant form of higher education globally. With nearly one quarter of its institutions of higher education "private," the US is nearly unique. (Only Japan compares.) Nonetheless, in the US, public institutions enroll some two-thirds of all college students in four-year institutions or some 5.8 million. Two-year public colleges add 11.1 million students, or taken together with the four-year institutions, over 80% of the total (Duderstadt, 2000). But of course all this could easily change.

Similarly, while it clear that "globalization" is a real phenomena and is not be taken lightly, it is easy to fail to acknowledge its complex and multi-dimensional character (Wagner, Currie, Delanty, Inayatullah). Accordingly, "globalization" will have different consequences as regards different institutions of higher education within a nation. And because of differences in the histories and political economies of the nations of the world, the consequences of globalization will likely be very different between the world's nations. This is quite forcefully brought out by comparing, e.g., the accounts of Curry, Su Hao, Garnier.

Although the evidence regards mainly students in American institutions of higher education, student attitudes toward and expectations of post secondary education are increasingly oriented toward career advancement and economic return. (See especially Ruch, Thomas.) This observation joins with another. While there is no doubt that higher education is changing rapidly, there is an unfortunate tendency to think nostalgically in terms of the "ideal" university as a place where students and faculty collaborate in face-to-face teaching/learning and where the goal is the emancipation of the human spirit. But not only was it the case that this ideal was rarely realized, but historically, it was the condition of only a privileged few. Moreover, there were always alternatives to the "traditional" college and university, sustained, as seems likely, by responding to needs

unmet by the traditional model. Of course, this raises questions regarding the uses and relation of markets to institutions of higher education (Ruch, Karelis, Smith).

For reasons that are not entirely clear, perhaps an aspect of globalization and perhaps not, there has been the rapid and surprising growth in recent years of degree-granting, for-profit colleges and universities, not only but perhaps especially in the US. In 1991, there was one for-profit, degree granting, accredited institution listed on US stock exchanges, DeVry, Inc. By 1999, there were forty (Ruch). Generating some \$16.5 billion in revenues, growth for-profit revenues increased by 20% in 2001 over the previous year. (As Ruch points out, the essential difference between private non-profits and for-profits is not that non-profits do not seek “profit,” but differences in their tax liability both as a source of revenue and form of expenditure.) More generally, institutions of higher education are increasingly engaged in what Max Weber termed “rationalization”—“privatizing,” and adopting business-like strategies, “managerialism” (Currie), with an eye toward cost-saving, e.g., replacing retiring tenure faculty with adjuncts (who now comprise some 42% of teaching faculty), and marketing in a competitive search for students who are “consumers.” (See Margolis)

Finally, with the use of internet technologies, distance education has taken on new meaning--“the virtual university.” Thus, as of November 2002, Phoenix University Online has a staff of some 1700 with some 7000 faculty—mostly part-time, teaching some 49,400 students. Phoenix reported a net income of \$64.3-million for last year (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1/8/02). Universitas 21, an international consortium of 17 universities from Asia, Australia, Europe and North America will offer wholly online degrees, beginning with a MBA to be offered in Asia in 2003. Nevertheless, at least the majority of our participants would agree that the “traditional” university is not going to disappear even if it changes its character and/or becomes increasingly less important.

But the hard questions remain. What does it all mean? While not all of the following essays address all the hard questions, most have a view, implicit or explicit as regards many of them. Thus,

1. First, there is the question of capitalism, globally considered. Given differences in the understanding of global capitalism, all would grant that it is a critical “mechanism” (or complex of mechanisms), but differ as to what it explains as regards outcomes in higher education. Do the processes of global capitalism fundamentally challenge the inherited forms of the University? Thus, there is considerable disagreement regarding the challenge of “neo-liberalism,” and whether the “traditional” university will become marginalized. (For some different views, see especially Currie, Margolis, Garnier and Delanty.) Secondly, as part of this, there is disagreement regarding the role of the State, both in terms of its fiscal capacities, and in terms of its direct and indirect roles in shaping the institutions of higher education, including its role in defining the tasks of higher education (Currie, Garnier, Hao, Wagner).

2. Related to the foregoing are questions of the use and nature of markets as regards higher education. While our participants would agree that the market/state polarity is at best an often misleading oversimplification, how should they be conceived and how are they related? (Wagner, Smith, Ruch). In what sense are students *not* consumers? In what sense, alternatively, can the university be transformer of value systems (Karelis, Thomas, Garnier, Delanty).

3. There is question of the role of technology? Our participants each reject a technological determinism, but there are differences, sometimes subtle, regarding how technology figures, or should figure in these outcomes. Odin notes that faculty are anything but enthusiastic about the use of the new technologies, even as supplements to their teaching, and our group acknowledged that a very solid case can be made for their appropriate use and that their capacities are by no means fully explored. But if it be granted that not all uses of the technologies are pedagogically sound, what is the appropriate pedagogy for the new technologies and what are its limits? For example, are there technological solutions to increasing access? How do we involve faculty in their use? (Odin, Margolis, Delanty).

4. There are a series of questions regarding the mission and goals of higher education, from an inherited ideal of *Bildung*, to the search for and dissemination of knowledge, to a concept emphasizing instrumental values, to its role in national and economic development, to a future- oriented idea of providing “institutional spaces where cognitive models for society to learn can emerge,” to a view which holds that higher education is and should be all of these. But if so, how is this to be accomplished? Who should determine this? (Karelis, Abeles, Bowen-James, Inayatullah, Smith, Delanty).

5. The foregoing raises deeper questions regarding the very idea of knowledge, including the provocative contrast between what Bowen-James and Abeles call “just-in-time” versus “just-in-case” knowledge, the distinction—increasingly difficult to draw, between “teaching” and “training,” the differences, overlapping with these, between knowing in the theoretical mode, knowing in the practical modes, and knowing as an essentially reflective process, and, finally, the view that there are alternative ways of knowing (Odin, Abeles, Delanty, Garnier, Inayatullah)

6. Another series of problems regards questions of justice, including questions of access and inequality. Thus, if widening participation is an over-riding good, should this be conceived in terms of the realization of human capacities, of attaining employment skills, including credentials for personal success, or in terms of efficiently realizing national goals, including the development of managerial, and scientific and technical knowledge? Or perhaps these are not disconnected? What changes in our current institutional arrangements are necessary? (Karelis, McDermott, Thomas, Su Hao, Bowen-James, Abeles, Garnier, Delanty.)

This volume aims to energize its readers to re-think higher education. In what was the third main novelty of this book, the authors have tried to be provocative and plain speaking—not an easy thing for persons socialized in the University. And consistent with our efforts to communicate, they have foregone the usual academic apparatus of footnoting references. A bibliography of works drawn on by our participants is appended following each essay, along with an annotated bibliography of book-length discussions pertinent to the themes of our volume.

The following Afterword, by Manicas, did not appear in the published volume. It is conveniently reproduced here.

### **Afterword**

There was an issue raised in the conference (and its continuation in the internet conversation) which persistently resurfaced. But while it an important part of all of the accounts in this volume, it was not systematically discussed in any of the papers. It is the issue of agency, the question of who have been the critical players in the changes in higher education that have occurred and who will be the critical players in the changes which will come.

A decision by the President or Prime Minister, or the legislative body of nation can have direct consequences on higher education in that nation. The essays in this volume provided a wealth of examples, from questions of funding to questions of access. Indeed, several of the essays suggested that these political actors have been, and would continue to be, the key decision-makers. It is also quite plain that leaders of finance and the corporate world also make decisions, as C.W. Mills put it, “of major social importance” and that especially in a period of accelerating globalization, these have consequences, direct and indirect, intended and unintended, on higher education. Several of our contributors suggested that these would be key players. Finally, we know also that leaders of institutions of higher education, Regents, Presidents, Vice-Chancellors and Deans, can sometimes make critical decisions. The organization of the University is one obvious example.

But what of faculty? All the participants at the conference have had experience in the higher education and most of us still function as members of a faculty. Several of our contributors raised questions about their role but especially as potentially, at least, key critical players. We reproduce a bit of an internet exchange between one of the editors and Tom Abeles on this issue. Tom’s intervention was entitled “Does it matter” and he asked a pregnant question: Why would anyone spend a bunch of money to bring a bunch of people to Honolulu for a conference on higher education and globalization? Here are the significant pieces of that conversation:

*Manicas: Fortunately, our group has some non-academics (who also understand the academy!), but our conference could generate a book which might move some thinking*

*about this complex. Me and the Center--who came up with the bucks-- hope so!!! Tom also raised some points regarding "faculties" in response to my question about their role in change. To anticipate, I am at best ambivalent about faculties as agents, and will try to say why.*

*Abeles: At one time I would have agreed with you that there could, should or must be "agents of change" - the party that pressed the button that started the machine that made the cybernetics and stuff, exposing the confusion and bluff, justifying the mummery jummery that created the constant k that covered the flaw and that finally destroyed the theory that Jack built (paraphrase from A Space Child's Mother Goose)*

*Looking at some of the theories in complexity, can we really find the one "typhoid Mary who created the "tipping point". Who or what turned the corner for e-learning that made it suddenly an attractive and economically viable option. One day the economics said it wouldn't work and David Noble and colleagues had their fingers in the dike and all of a sudden it was a mad race to see who could put more virtual courses into the marketplace of ideas. Perhaps a study of this phenomenon might yield some insights?*

*Manicas: My point is exactly that all of us--with highly unequal capacities-- are parties to change no matter what we do. The political problem of change remains: where are the key locations? Hence my list, (beginning with the people who have a good deal of power). For our special problem, I am very much interested in knowing whether faculties will be key players--or merely "go along" while others act in this way or that.*

*This is especially pertinent regarding the use of the new technologies.*

*I am not interested in finding a typhoid Mary...Of course, today's players, like all players, have different resources and interests and it is part of our problem to see what they are.*

*Abeles: I am not sure, but it looks like you argue both sides of this issue. First, you are pessimistic that faculty will lead the change and then you express the hope that the monograph from this conference will provide some direction.*

*I too am not sanguine that faculty will lead the change. It would be important to understand why. Is it part of the factors that have lead the faculty to take less interest in the administration and other issues around the overall direction of the institution. Does it have to do with shifting roles and responsibilities?*

*If not the faculty, then who? any party other than the faculty, essentially emasculate the faculty (is that a chauvinistic term?)*

*Manicas: Indeed, I am pessimistic because I doubt that our conference (or anything that I can think of) will sufficiently energize faculties to re-think higher education. Indeed, there may be more hope that some key college president or governor will do so? More generally I take Gramsci's position: pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will.*

*I also keep in mind the idea offered by J.M. Keynes, that politics owes more to some crackpot philosopher than we appreciate.*

Others chimed in:

*Odin: The faculties are resistant to thinking about change because they have invested so much in the old paradigm and they genuinely want to believe that things will continue going on as they have, at least as long as they are around. I also feel that the participants from different countries perceived the change in higher education in different ways and with different levels of urgency.*

*Abeles: This seems to be the seminal issue. Are we somnambulating through the traditional academic motions of holding a conference and publishing something to sit on the shelf awaiting a chance to be discovered by some enlightened provost or venture capitalist. What did we discover? Or maybe we don't understand what it is that lies buried in the intellectual detritus of our musings? One person's garbage is another's gold?*

We did not resolve this. Neither Abeles nor Manicas wanted to argue that faculty will lead the change. Abeles wanted an explanation and offered part of the answer. He asked rhetorically: *Is it part of the factors that have led the faculty to take less interest in the administration and other issues around the overall direction of the institution? Does it have to do with shifting roles and responsibilities?*

A larger answer might go like this:

Faculties claim that it is their goal to teach undergraduates, but indeed, universities are currently structured so to make this nearly impossible. The obstacles begin with corporate administration—explained at least in part, as Abeles notes, by the willingness, perhaps eagerness, of faculty to be left alone “to do their work” (Ruch, Smith). It includes the reward system of faculty, beginning with the socialization built into the constraints on the goals of the PhD as the condition for a credential, and more generally of “research”—much of highly dubious value to anybody, except perhaps the status quo (McDermott). It includes the tenure system, which (whatever its value as regards academic freedom—and this is not obvious) has led to the creation of two classes of faculty, senior faculty who too often have lost their motivation to either learn or teach, or for other reasons, too often disdain the freshman course, and junior faculty struggling to publish, and exploited part-timers who, teaching six courses at four institutions to keep a roof over their heads, have little time to do anything but to work on their dissertations and stay one day ahead of the textbook. It includes cynical “teaching awards.” And it includes departmental specialization which serves very well not only to isolate faculties from the concerns of students but from one another and the larger community (Karelis).

Of course, the foregoing sounds much like nailing the faculty as “easy targets.” But that is not the point. Most faculty are both sincere, intelligent and hardworking, but if they are functioning in a set of practices whose outcomes are inconsistent with their

explicit goals, then we need to ask why? Perhaps because these practices seem so “natural,” faculty are not clear themselves about the unintended consequences of their actions. Perhaps, like non-voters in representative regimes, they do understand what is happening, but believe that they can do little to change these practices. Perhaps they just like it the way things are and do not want to have the applecart upset?

Plainly, higher education is changing rapidly and however engaged or disengaged are faculties, the direction of this change could not be exclusively in their hands. There are still those whose location in government and the corporate world give them pre-eminent power, and there are the students and their families, doing what they can to get ahead—or merely to stay afloat.

But Tom Abeles’s question remains unanswered.

## Notes on the Participants to the Conference

Tom Abeles is President of Sagacity, Inc., a member of the Global Alliance for Transnational Education and Editor of *Horizon*. He is currently developing a virtual campus for the graduate school at Hamline University. Dr. Abeles has been active in discussions, in print and online, of the implications of the digital revolution.

Alan Bowen-James is CEO of NextED, “the leading Asia-based provider of online learning solutions for the corporate, professional and higher education markets.” Founded in Hong Kong in 1998, NextEd has 8 offices in Australia, China, Hong Kong, Malaysia, the UK and the US.

Jan Currie is Associate Professor, School of Education, Murdoch University. She is Co-Editor of *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives* (Sage, 1998).

Gerard Delanty is Professor of Sociology in the University of Liverpool, UK. He was Visiting Professor at York University, Toronto in 1998, and Visiting Professor at Doshisha University, Kyoto, Japan, in 2000. He is the Editor of the *European Journal of Social Theory* and author of *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality* (Macmillan, 1995), *Social Theory in a Changing World* (Polity Press, 1999), *Modernity and Postmodernity: Knowledge, Power, the Self* (Sage, 2000), *Citizenship in a Global Age* (Open University Press, 2000), *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society* (Open University Press, 2001), and (with Patrick O'Mahony) *Nationalism and Social Theory* (Sage, forthcoming 2002).

Leonardo Garnier is a political economist at the University of Costa Rica. His writings

include problems of globalization and human rights. He has had extensive experience with UN agencies, PNUD and ECLAC, most recently with UNICEF in Ecuador.

Sohail Inayatulla does extensive work is Australian and East Asian universities, but especially as regards corporatization, the internet, multiculturalism, democratization and organizational transformation. He is Co-Editor of *The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University* (Greenwood Press, 1999).

Charles (Buddy) Karelis was President of Colgate University and, for many years, Director of the Fund for the Development of Secondary Education (FIPSE), Department of Education. In that capacity he was involved with a host of innovative programs.

Michael Margolis is Professor Political Science, University of Cincinnati and the author of the widely read essay, "Brave New Universities."

John. J. McDermott is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy and Humanities, Texas A&M University. He was a Danforth Fellow and author of many books and articles on American culture and philosophy, including philosophy of education.

Jaishree Odin is an Associate Professor in Liberal Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa. She has published extensively on ALN pedagogy and the implications of the new technologies. More recently, she served as Assistant Dean for Outreach College, responsible for developing various entirely new on-line programs for UHM.

Su Hao is Chair of the Department of Diplomacy of the College of Foreign Affairs, Beijing University, China. A Fulbright Fellow at Columbia University, he has had a continuing interest in the consequences of globalization on Higher Education in China.

Richard S. Ruch is author of *Higher Ed, Inc: The Rise of the For-Profit University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001). He has served as chief academic officer at DeVry College of Technology, and Dean of the College of Business Administration at Rider University. Dr. Ruch holds a Ph.D. in Communication from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and did post-doctoral study in higher education at Harvard's Institute for Education Management. He is currently studying theology at Princeton Theological Seminary.

Charles Smith, Department of Sociology, Queens College, CUNY, is a former Dean, Provost and Assistant to the President at Queens College. He authored, *Market Values in American Higher Education: The Pitfalls and the Promises* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), *Understanding the Mind of the Market* (1999) and

*Auctions: The Social Construction of Value* (1989). Professor Smith is Editor of *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*.

Scott Thomas, Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia, has authored (and co-authored) a number of important studies of student attitudes and the income effects of higher education, including differences in outcomes for graduates of types of institutions.

Peter Wagner, University of Warwick, is currently based at the European University Institute in Florence. His publications include *The Scholar's Space: A Topography of Academic Practices* (with Heidrun Friese, in German, 1993); *Social Sciences and Modern States* (co-editor, 1991); *The Social Sciences and the State: France, Italy, Germany, 1870-1980* (in German, 1990). Wagner was with the *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung* and the Free University of Berlin, and has conducted research at the *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, Paris, the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences, Upsala, and the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley.

#### **Selected Bibliography** (annotated by the Editors)

Stanley Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000). A political “radical” and academic conservative, Aronowitz connects labor market issues with education in a useful way, but would seem to be a bit nostalgic regarding City College (in the 30s), his personal experiences as blue-collar who made it, and unions. Perhaps paradoxically, while he rejects Dewey’s “largely ignored concept of education for democracy and democracy in education” as “beyond possibility” given the present situation, he offers us a more democratic, integrated version of the old Chicago core: history, literature, science and philosophy (p. 177). Unfortunately, he seems to lack understanding of the institutional obstacles to his reconstruction. He finds no justification for employing the new technologies (even while he thinks of CD-Roms and e-mail as the core of this).

Michael Bérubé and Cary Nelson (eds.), *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics and the Crisis of the Humanities* (New York: Routledge, 1995). This volumen does not succeed in its promise to “orchestrate” perspectives on the “the discourses of fiscal policy, politics and the production of knowledge” (p. 5). Most of the contributors are in English Departments and related fields. Despite the title, there is very little economics (Michael Apple’s quasi-Marxist account is an exception), but as the subtitle also suggests, the main concern is recent “the cultural wars.” Barry Gross’s right-wing polemic may be the most interesting?

Burton R. Clark, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation* (Pergamon Press, 2001). Sheldon Rothblatt, an informed historian of higher education, 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 address 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." (Clark has very good essay in Rothblatt and Wittrock, below).

Jonathan R. Cole, Elinor G. Barber and Stephen R. Graubard (eds.), *The Research University in a Time of Discontent* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1993). This volumen is mainly a defense: not surprising given that the contributors 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.

Jan Currie and Janice Angela Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization : Critical Perspectives* (Thousand Oakes, CA.: Sage, 1998). This volume is excellent for comparative work on higher education, including Currie on Australia and America, Sheila Slaughter on Canadian universities, Donald Fisher and Kjell Rubenson on Norway, Arild Tjeldvoll on higher education reform in Australia and France, Robert Lingard and Fazal Rizvi on the impact of NAFTA on Mexican universities.

Gerard Delanty, *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society* (Open University Press, 2001). 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 (including participants at this conference) and has put it together in a convincing way. He argues that the late 60s and 70s 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 post-modern or instrumentalist), he offers that the role of the university could be enhanced, and this in the direction which would contribute to more democratic and cosmopolitan forms of citizenship.

James J. Duderstadt, *A University for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). Duderstadt writes as a former President of the University of Michigan. The book is disappointing, partly because of the nearly bulleted style and because some of the ground is familiar. He has, however, a deep appreciation of governance issues ("the history of higher education in America suggests that, in reality, the faculty has had relatively little influence over the evolution of the university" (p. 247), the causes and consequences of "privatization" and the challenge of the new technologies which could promote "the growth of entirely new learning organizations" (p. 304). This book could be read in conjunction with Ruchs and Delanty.

Sohail Inayatulla, co-editor of *The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University* (Greenwood Press, 1999). This volume contains a range of

essays (some by the participants of this conference) on pertinent topics. Very good comparative materials.

Peter Jarvis, *Universities and Corporate Universities: The Higher Learning Industry in Global Society* (London: Kogan Page, 2001). A professor of Continuing Education, Jarvis argues that globalization forces “a learning market” in which established institutions no longer have a monopoly, that “corporate universities” (not the university as a corporation, but institutions like MacDonal’d’s Hamburger University which includes a 22-language simultaneous facility and has trained 65,000 managers) are competing in this market. By 1995, there were over 1,000 corporate universities with budgets totaling over \$52 billion (p. 113). Distance education, led by the British Open University, is “one of the easiest ways of marketing education” and developing technologies will extend this. Quoting Kenny-Wallace, “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 has arrived”(p. 113). Jarvis concludes that since the traditional university does not know what it is, it is easy for a wholly instrumental discourse to dominate.

Christopher J. Lucas, *Crisis in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education in America* (New York: St.Martins Press, 1996). A historical acute account which de-mystifies some prevailing beliefs (e.g., about general education, tenure, open admission, the culture of faculties, governance), and offers some very positive ideas for reform, including, e.g., abandoning the idea of a disciplinary department as an autonomous unit for resource allocations and re-designing administrative configurations which would enable realizing clearly articulated goals, e.g., 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.

Bill Readings, *University in Ruins* (Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1996). Completed just prior to his death in the crash American Eagle flight 4184, Readings book is provocative, but too often obscure and intemperate. The basic argument is that the modern university came to 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” (p. 12). He 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” (p. 160). “Thought demands that we ask what it means, because its status as mere name—radically detached from truth—enforces that question” (p. 160). “Cultural Studies,” for him, is not a possible answer since “culture no longer matters as an *idea* for the institution” (p. 91). The history is dubious, and the analysis, both abstract and over-generalized, would seem to be distorted by his disciplinary and theoretical perspective.

Sheldon Rothblatt and Bjorn Wittrock (eds.), *The European and American University Since 1800: Historical and Sociological Essays* (Cambridge: CUP Press, 1993). This

volume is most useful set of historical and comparative overviews. See especially essays by Clark and Wittrock.

Richard S. Ruch, *Higher Ed, Inc.: The Rise of the Non-Profit University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2001). Ruch's book is an extremely helpful account of the rise of the non-profit, and the consequences for the non-profits. For him, "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" (p. 151).

Sheila Slaughter, Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism : Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1999). This volume is a generally conventional social scientific examination of critical aspects of higher education, including in the argument, self-conscious "theory" and a good deal of a quantitative information and survey research materials. They 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" (p. 207). Two "scenarios," a worst case and a best case (pp. 242-245) are very persuasive, and neither are encouraging.

Charles J. Sykes, *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1990). The Solomons (below) quote one illustrative text: "The story of the collapse of American higher education is the story of the rise of the professoriate. No understanding of the academic disease is possible without an understanding of the Academic Man, this strange mutation of 20<sup>th</sup>-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 desolate higher education" (See Solomon and Solomon, p. 204f.)

Robert and John Solomon, *Up the University: Recreating Higher Education* (Reading: Ma.: Addison Wesley, 1993). A very well known and well regarded professor of philosophy and his brother, a professor of classics, offer an energetic look at the university from "the inside." The book is fun reading. They have one very powerful theses: Universities exist to teach undergraduates, but indeed, they are currently structured so to make this nearly impossible. The obstacles begin with corporate administration, and extend to distortion regarding "research," the PhD 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, 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 which sustain all those practices which they rightly condemn.

Charles W. Smith, *Market Values in American Higher Education : The Pitfalls and Promises* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000). Smith finds a number of “false diagnoses and faulty cures, e.g., serious misreading of the fiscal and organizational realities. This resulted in a “paste and mix response to growth in higher education. He offers that we need to decide what we want and determine clearly what we have, He concludes with some “guiding principles” and specific recommendations.

Joel Spring, *Education and the Rise of Global Economy* (Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1998). Spring 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” (p. xi). He now sees this to be naïve “in the face of the uncontrolled power of global corporations.” He now thinks that “the right to an education should include an education in human rights and democratic power.” Some useful data, but the analysis is thin.

Geoffrey D. White (ed.), *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* (Amherst: Prometheus, 2000). The volume is a collection of essays by “leftish” critics, including David Noble, Michael Parenti, Leonard Minsky, Sheila Slaughter, Howard Zinn, Michael Zweig, and Ralph Nader. Some are too brief, some offer critiques of specific aspects of the problem, and some provide small case studies.

