ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226318903

Globalization, Social Movements, and the American University: Implications for Research and Practice

Chapter · April 2009

DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9628-0_7

CITATIONS
13

READS
604

2 authors, including:

Robert Rhoads
University of California, Los Angeles

86 PUBLICATIONS **2,344** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

All content following this page was uploaded by Robert Rhoads on 30 March 2015.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Globalization, Social Movements, and the American University: Implications for Research and Practice*

Robert A. Rhoads and Amy Liu

Introduction: The Global Landscape

One clear challenge confronting the contemporary university is the fact that the scope and direction of higher education are increasingly shaped by forces and interests that, for lack of a better word, may be described as "global" in nature. For example, numerous writers concerned about the fate of higher education and typically operating within the international comparative arena have examined a variety of transnational and multinational influences on today's universities. Some stress the considerable influence of governmental and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) concerned with the role of universities in national and international development, including such organizations as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), and World Bank (Altbach, 2000, 2001a, b; Calderone and Rhoads, 2005; Labi, 2007; Rhoads and Mina, 2001; Santos, 2006; Stromquist, 2002). Although it may be quite fashionable to point to various efforts to restructure the modern university at the hands of powerful transnational organizations, including transnational corporations (TNCs) (Stromquist, 2002), pressure to reform today's universities is just as likely to result from any or all of the following: local and regional initiatives to increase successful participation in a global knowledge-based economy; perceived university entrepreneurial opportunities associated with an expanding global economy; regional and international movements to address human rights, including efforts to increase educational opportunities for ethnic minorities; the growing importance of global health and environmental matters such as the HIV/AIDs pandemic and global warming; and legislative and policy decisions related to the war on global terrorism (the U.S.A. Patriot Act may be an example here). In a very real sense, concerns about town-and-gown relationships are now matched, or more likely exceeded, by transnational and multinational forces acting through complex and interconnected networks and associations. Thus, understanding today's universities and their relationship to the broader society must necessarily take into account that we are living in what Castells (1997) described as a global network society.

J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* ,

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2008

The most powerful force acting on today's network societies is the global economy (Castells, 1997). Indeed, the global economy deeply implicates the modern American university and challenges the basic structure of the nation-state and its foundational institutions. This point was driven home quite nicely by Touraine (1988), when he argued that the power of the nation-state to support public-good enterprises is seriously limited by the self-interests of global capitalism. The argument here is not so much that the nation-state has "disappeared," but that it has become increasingly tied to private interests and the pursuit of profit (Bakan, 2004; Calderone and Rhoads, 2005; Chomsky, 1999; Morrow and Torres, 2000; Reich, 2007; Stiglitz, 2002). The emergence of a new form of society, one Touraine described as "postindustrial," poses profound challenges to organizations largely founded on an industrial model of the world. What we see in part is the limited capacity of organizations to advance social reform and the public good, given the complex maze and networks through which reform initiatives must now wind. Further complicating efforts is the challenge of overcoming the often competing interests of global capitalism. This is especially true in an era of neoliberalism, wherein markets and privatization assume hegemony in the tradition of Reaganism and Thatcherism (Apple, 2000; Giroux, 2002; Hall and Jacques, 1990; Torres and Schugurensky, 2002). Indeed, traditional institutions such as the American university are more likely to face assault as *targets of reform* to be brought more tightly into the functioning of private capital (Clark, 2001; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Because of the rapidly changing idea of society and the limited power of traditional organizations to effect progressive social change, the logical outcome for Touraine is to shift social change analyses from institutional channels to the growing power and capacity of social movements.

The implications of Touraine's work, as well as that of social theorists such as Castells (1997), Chomsky (1999, 2006), Santos (2006), and Torres (1998, 2002), among others, are that social reform initiatives are just as likely to be successfully stewarded by social actors working within the context of social movements as they are to be championed by those we typically define as "policymakers" operating within and through traditional organizational and political structures. This is true of university reform as well. For example, the struggle between supporters and opponents over the use of affirmative action in college and university admissions in the United States often is portrayed as a research-based legal battle concerning who has the best evidence to support a pro- or anti-affirmative action position, when in fact the struggle operates at an ideological and political level, spearheaded by a jazz-like cacophony of diverse interest groups (Pusser, 2004; Rhoads et al., 2005). Similarly, educational reforms resulting from the social movements of the 1960s, including the civil rights movement, have in recent years come under attack by perhaps an equally powerful movement defined by Apple (2000) as the "conservative restoration." This conservative-led movement arguably has contributed to what Orfield and others described as the deepening crisis of racial resegregation in US public schools (Orfield et al., 1997; Orfield et al., 2002/2003). Clearly, initiatives to refashion US schools and universities are not always led by those we normally

consider policymakers, but rather often are the result of collective action from the left or the right by highly coordinated individuals and groups acting in the truest sense of a social movement.

With the preceding in mind, our goal is to examine the changing terrain of the American university. We focus particularly on the growing impact of globalization and the global knowledge economy, which we see as having both direct and indirect effects on universities. Direct effects are felt through various global processes, including the increasing exchange of students and scholars internationally as well as the growing reliance by scholars on transnational communication systems (i.e., the Internet and e-mail). Indirect effects may result from changes to postindustrial knowledge-based societies and the concomitant implications for university teaching, research, and service. We also see the impact globalization has on the changing nature of society and the subsequent role that social movements play as vehicles for advancing the public good. These latter issues also implicate the university, given its long-standing role in service to the greater good. Hence, our discussion essentially brings three complex ideas together – globalization, changing conceptions of society, and the role of social movements – for the purpose of better understanding the challenges confronting today's universities. Of particular importance to us is the matter of the public good, including most notably the role of the university in advancing social reform. Our assumptions here are relatively consistent with Touraine and other recent critical social thought that views social movements as vital to progressive social change in a postindustrial global environment. The two questions that arise as we consider the modern American university are: (1) How is the university to be reformed in this environment, and (2) How is the university to participate in broader social reforms?

In situating social movements at the heart of our analysis, we are not suggesting that they are in some way new modalities for influencing higher education policy. Clearly, social and political movements have played a key role throughout the history of US higher education. For example, religious movements played a critical role in establishing the early colonial colleges. The Morrill Act of 1862 and the related land-grant movement were a response to groups advocating a broader dispersion of professional expertise and access to higher education for rural students. The G.I. Bill arguably was the outcome of pressure from various groups seeking educational benefits for soldiers in the post-World War II era. And the civil rights movement of the 1960s played a central role in advancing Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society efforts to expand college access for traditionally under-represented populations. Despite this extended history of social movements shaping higher education policy, scholars have long lacked theoretical frameworks for linking change in higher education to social and political movements (Slaughter, 1990; Pusser, 2003). This chapter seeks to move beyond prevalent frameworks to identify key social movements emerging from globalization and to use theories of globalization and institutions to better understand contemporary transformations in higher education policy and practice. A good starting point for such a discussion is to more thoroughly explore globalization as a phenomenon.

Globalization Conceptualized

A commonly held view depicts globalization as the reduction of time and space (Giddens, 1990). Along these lines, Held (1991) defined globalization as "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (p. 9). Such transformations have the potential to homogenize the world with some scholars arguing that the wealthiest and most dominant nations influence the economic, political, and cultural structures of other societies to such a degree that it might be described as the "Westernization," "Americanization," or "McDonaldization" of the world (Barber, 1995; Ritzer, 1993). Although there is no doubt some validity to such arguments, globalization produces such an intricate system of human flows and social networks that to see one region, country, or corporation assuming so much dominance may be more hyperbole than reality, and in many cases local cultures adapt global influences for their own benefit (Luke and Luke, 2000). The view of globalization advanced in this chapter suggests something far beyond observing Hungarian hip-hop artists performing in the clubs of Budapest, or traveling to Guangzhou, China, and discovering many street signs to be in English, or spotting a McDonald's or Starbucks in Mexico City. Indeed, a key aspect of Held's definition, among others, is the importance placed on complex social relations and how human interactions are increasingly intertwined in contemporary life. Along these lines, Urry (1998) noted that "the development of various global flows transforms the constraints and opportunities which face individual humans, and in particular locates people and objects in novel networks" (p. 4). A similar view is expressed in the work of Castells (1997) and his idea of the "network society," which also highlights the interconnectedness of contemporary societies and cultures.

The idea that globalization has altered the very nature of society is central to Touraine's (1988) work. From his perspective, society no longer exists in the manner and form that helped to define the field of sociology. Consequently, Touraine argued for a new vision of sociology, grounded not so much in the concept of society, but instead in the idea of action. As he explained:

> Today, with the waning of the historical conditions that gave forth the science of societies, we must create a sociology of action. This task is rendered more urgent by the constant threat posed to the field of social life by totalitarian forces, and by the fact that the new social movements, for their part, cannot develop as long as political actors, especially intellectuals, force them into the molds of institutional channels and languages that belong to an unrecoverable past. (p. 28)

Emerging forms of society demand new ways of thinking about social change – namely, Touraine called for a "return of the actor," who, given the limited power of modern organizations to intervene in complex global networks and systems, must now act in the context of a social movement (pp. 8–9). In terms of higher education policy research, a sociology of action translates into intensifying our focus on the ways in which social actors participate in various social and political movements to achieve particular ends. Thus, as networks, fashioned and framed by

the dictates of global capital, increasingly shape the operations and functions of the nation-state and its foundational institutions, including the university, the importance of social movements as vehicles for social change also increases. Touraine's work draws attention to considering the complex ways in which globalization impacts societies as well as the ways in which we might organize a discussion of its effects.

Numerous social theorists have developed typologies for systematically analyzing both the direct and indirect effects of globalization on societies. For example, Torres and Rhoads (2006) delineated five manifestations or "faces" of globalization relating to the world economy, oppositional social movements, culture, human rights, and global war/terrorism. Similarly, Kellner (2000) noted that globalization "involves crucial economic, political, and cultural dimensions" (p. 304). Other authors have further developed these dimensions as part of a broad effort to better understand changes taking place at the societal level. Chomsky (1999) examined the intersection of global economics and politics, pointing to the ways in which neoliberal trade policies actually have failed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the world's population, despite claims often made to the contrary. Chua (2004) also examined globalization's economic and political impact, focusing on how the exportation of "free market democracy" contributes to ethnic resentment and global instability. Luke and Luke (2000) offered a "situated account" of the cultural dimensions of globalization by focusing on social change in Thailand. They presented a counter-narrative to the homogenizing effects of globalization (i.e., Westernization, Americanization, McDonaldization), arguing that "only through situated, local, and self-critical analyses can we begin to see the two-way, mutually constitutive dynamics of local-global flows of knowledge, power, and capital" (p. 276). For our purposes though, we find Kellner's (2000) discussion of "globalization from above" and "globalization from below" as an excellent starting point for better understanding the ways in which global forces are acting on today's societies. Kellner's discussion helps us to bring the key ideas of neoliberalism and social movements front and center and offers a framework for considering the vast ways in which globalization compels universities to pursue knowledge-based revenues in a manner consistent with neoliberal ideals, while at the same time opening spaces for oppositional activity such as student movements to challenge sweatshops, low wages, and world poverty.

Globalization from Above

The idea of globalization from above raises the issue of neoliberalism and the ways in which the world economy is being shaped by a particular view of capitalism and global economics. We approach the idea of neoliberalism as critical social theorists skeptical of many of its claims. Adopting a critical stance of course makes us vulnerable to accusations of acting as "ideologues." For us, this is rather ironic but not surprising, given the fact that the discourse of modernization, as Kellner (2000) pointed out, presents ideas such as globalization "as part of an inexorable trajectory of progress and modernity that is not to be – or that simply cannot be – contested

or challenged … the discourse of globalization is on the surface neutral" (p. 302). We reject claims that neoliberal globalization is the natural outcome of modernity (more or less a social Darwinian view), arguing instead that it is akin to a Potemkin village,[1] where in fact neoliberalism's most dangerous and oppressive effects often are intentionally concealed (Boron and Torres, 1996; Chomsky, 1999; Giroux, 2002; Harvey, 2003; Rhoads, 2003).

Neoliberalism has been described as globalization from above because it is advanced by powerful IGOs and TNCs and is often seen, especially by people in the developing world, as an imposed ideology and economic condition. Torres and Rhoads (2006) highlighted some of the central tenets of neoliberalism:

> Neoliberals call for an opening of national borders for the purpose of increased commodity and capital exchange, the creation of multiple regional markets, the elevation of free markets over state-controlled markets and interventions, the proliferation of fast-paced economic and financial transactions, and the presence of governing systems other than nation-states. (p. 8)

Understood in this light, the market is positioned as the ultimate system of adjudication and fairness in shaping global trade. Given that the orthodoxy of neoliberalism stresses the market as the definitive source of what is good and right, privatization is at the heart of globalization from above.

Mander (2006) pointed out that privatization essentially involves transferring public resources and services to the corporate sector; the central belief being that the private sector will manage the "public commons" in a more just and efficient manner than government and government-sanctioned enterprises. Privatization may involve the transfer of "freshwater, forestlands, energy resources, and even the genetic structures of plants and humans" as well as "public services such as water delivery, education, transportation, health services and sanitation, public broadcasting, welfare services, etc." (p. 7). Critical of the perspective that markets produce the most effective and fair distribution of resources, Apple (2000) pointed out that "markets are as powerfully destructive as they are productive in people's lives" (p. 63).

Free trade and privatization are the foundations of neoliberal ideology and the quest to promote a global economy. The essential argument follows the "trickle down" logic of Reaganomics, stressing, as Mander (2006) noted, that "a rising tide will lift all boats" (p. 8). Many scholars critical of neoliberal globalization, including Mander, have opined that "the twenty years since the model became dominant have not brought prosperity; instead they have greatly increased the separation between wealthy and poor within nations and among them" (p. 8). For Mander, the reality is that "the model does not lift all boats, only yachts" (p. 8).

---

[1] The reference to "Potemkin village" derives from the story of the Empress Catherine the Great of Russia and her prime minister, Grigori Potemkin, who allegedly had fake villages (simply façades) constructed along the banks of the Danube "and forcibly staffed these with cheering peasants, in order to impress the Empress with how prosperous and thriving the area was." Consequently, the phrase "Potemkin village" has come to signify some sort of "impressive façade" or disguise aimed at concealing undesirable facts, conditions, and/or consequences (Maxwell, 1996, p. 99).

Much of the scholarly work on neoliberalism raises serious questions about the power and autonomy of the modern nation-state. Scholars following this line of thought generally argue that IGOs, TNCs, and multinational enterprises (MNEs), along with regional economies and their governing bodies, including tribunals sanctioned by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the European Union (EU), limit the autonomy and power of nation-states (Calderone and Rhoads, 2005). Some even posit the end of the nation-state or the idea of a disappearing or declining nation-state (Held, 1990; Ohmae, 1996), suggesting the possibility of a world largely governed by the wealthiest corporations of our time. Others counter this argument and instead claim that the nation-state increasingly focuses its energies on advancing the interests of capital over all other interests (Carnoy, 1993; Chomsky, 1999). In fact, Holton (1998) argued that nation-states play a critical role in policing global financial transactions through the signatory power they hold over organizations such as the IMF and World Bank. Furthermore, Carnoy (2001) maintained that nation-states that have transitioned to knowledge-based economies must incorporate "efficient state apparatuses with well-developed civil societies that provide growing markets, stable political conditions, and steady public investment in human capital" (p. 70).

The fact that some nations have far greater power and influence than others contributes to the idea of globalization from above, especially from the perspective of nations with limited power in shaping global markets and the flow of capital. This largely explains why so much of the opposition to neoliberalism, as well as to organizations like the IMF and World Bank, is deeply rooted in the Developing World (Boron and Torres, 1996; Burbach, 2001; Chomsky, 2006; Mander and Tauli-Corpuz, 2006; Rhoads and Torres, 2006). If we consider the former Keynesian welfare state as concerned with developing social programs for its citizens first and foremost, then from this standpoint the nation-state indeed has disappeared and in its place has emerged the machinery for advancing the hegemony of capital enterprises (Calderone and Rhoads, 2005). The complicity of the modern nation-state, though, brings about the rise of grassroots oppositional movements seeking to derail the spread of neoliberal orthodoxy. As Kellner (2000) noted:

> While on one level globalization significantly increases the power of big corporations and big government, it can also empower groups and individuals who were previously left out of the democratic dialogue and terrain of political struggle. (p. 301)

Political and civic engagement through social movements, or what Kellner described as "globalization from below," is a key vehicle by which people may resist various aspects of neoliberal globalization.

Globalization from Below

Globalization from below speaks to various forms of opposition and corresponds to a great degree with the increasing relevance of social movements, especially those that might be described as "grassroots" in nature. Arising to some extent from the

"so-called" antiglobalization movements – so-called because they are not really in opposition to globalization in general, but contest neoliberal versions of it – grassroots efforts to counter corporate domination have offered a possible structure for social change. Emerging largely from a shared vision of resistance to corporate and IGO control of the global economy, groups of social actors have worked together toward furthering common ideals rooted in particular versions of social justice, equality, and democracy (Kellner, 2002). Because social life is increasingly tied to globally networked societies, social movements become a primary means of advocating for changes aimed at countering neoliberal domination (Castells, 1997).

At a most basic level, social movements may be understood as coordinated or aligned activity among two or more social actors. The Italian theorist Alberoni (1983) went so far as to suggest that even the act of falling in love may be appreciated in some manner or form from the perspective of social movement theorizing. Although falling in love may constitute a social movement at its most basic level, analyses of more traditional movements such as the development of Islam, the Christian Reformation, the French and Russian revolutions, or the American civil rights movement of the 1960s likely offer greater insight into the nature of collective struggle. Hence for us, paying attention to more large-scale struggles makes sense in exploring globalization from below. However, we hold on to the most basic element of Alberoni's thinking: that at their heart, social movements are two or more actors coordinating lines of action.

Consistent with our line of reasoning, social theorists such as Johnston et al. (1994) argued that the "new social movements" differ from movements of the past in that class structure is less likely, although not altogether unlikely, to serve as the social basis for contemporary forms of collective action. They posited that social statuses such as youth, gender, sexual orientation, or citizenship also are likely to provide the basis for shared struggle. Indeed, identity struggle, or identity politics, has been seen as derailing some of the classic Marxist ambitions of the left, whereby class struggle was to be the defining anchor of collective efforts to reorganize society, often in revolutionary ways (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 1999; McLaren et al., 1999; Rikowski and McLaren, 1999). In this regard, contemporary movements are seen as moving beyond a dialectical Marxist conception of social struggle and instead are shaped by a "pluralism of ideas and values" (Johnston et al., 1994, p. 7). For example, when protesters disrupted the 1999 WTO summit in Seattle, labor activists and Green Movement environmentalists marched alongside right-wing protectionist groups acting in opposition to the role of IGOs in shaping US foreign policy. Similar crosscutting movements are evident on US campuses, and often in reaction to global processes as well. For example, diverse groups of students at colleges and universities around the country have organized protests against NAFTA since its adoption in the early 1990s.

Another key feature of present-day movements is that they are far more likely than in the past to be diffused and decentralized (Johnston et al., 1994). This may in part be explained by the ways in which advanced technology and Internet-based communication systems create the possibility for social movements to be both local and global simultaneously (Kellner, 2002). Although a group of students organizing

as part of the Free Burma Coalition may attend a demonstration at a particular US campus, their actions are orchestrated and aligned to a great degree through e-mail correspondences and shared information available through Web sites, all of which help to keep movement actors somewhat in step at a global level.

In seeking to analyze social movements, Castells described them as “symptoms of our societies” that provide insight into the ways in which groups of actors understand and interpret social processes happening around them (1997, p. 70). Therefore, when various activists, including farmers, peasants, students, and environmentalists, come together to oppose global economic policies being developed at the macro-level by leaders of the G8, interpretations associated with particular strains of globalization are made more visible. Whether social movements are successful or not in transforming the current value systems and institutions of society may be less relevant than the fact that new meaning is created from which new forms of acceptance or continued resistance develop.

There are countless examples of oppositional movements arising to challenge dominant forms of globalization. At their roots, these movements all essentially confront the neoliberal appropriation of the present world economy and the corresponding framing of economic relations. The structures being challenged often are in place as a consequence of the push for privatization and free trade expansionism at the expense of locally situated public welfare and local enterprise.

One excellent example of globalization from below is the 1994 Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas, Mexico. This movement is remarkable for the sophisticated challenge it offered to globalization and the powerful call for promoting local issues. Although concerns of the Zapatistas date back to centuries of abuse that Indians and peasants from the area endured at the hands of colonizers, bureaucrats, and settlers, more recent struggles were tied to conflict with the Mexican government over land rights (Castells, 1997). Additionally, capital interests tied to cattle ranching and the emergence of the petroleum industry led to significant social upheaval throughout the Chiapas region (Burbach, 2001). Ill will toward the Mexican government grew as its pro-modernization strategies increased with the passage of NAFTA. The situation for local communities in Chiapas simply was not socially, politically, and economically sustainable; Mexico was modernizing, but the plundering of the resource-rich state of Chiapas left its peasant and Indian communities destitute in its wake. The Zapatista rebellion emerged as a struggle against the presumed universal inevitability and acceptance of unchecked global capitalism and was marked by the establishment of horizontal networks and the clever use of global technologies to advance an oppositional position. Indeed, Burbach (2001) described the Zapatista rebellion as “the first postmodern revolutionary movement,” because of its creative use of media and demands for change that moved beyond the simplified dichotomy of capitalism and socialism (p. 116). The Zapatistas’ message spread through global networks, courtesy of the information revolution. Furthermore, their communiqués, praxis, and ongoing dialogue offered an important and experientially grounded critique of neoliberal globalization, while capturing the attention of oppositional groups around the world (Castells, 1997).

Grassroots oppositional movements also emerged in Bolivia, where the failures of neoliberalism to provide for the indigenous population led to mounting aggravation and subsequent demonstrations of power by the country's poorest residents (York, 2006). As in Mexico with the Zapatistas, years of economic suffering fueled Bolivia's approximately 56–70% indigenous population and their reaction to more recent changes tied to the rise of the free trade movement, including significant pressure from the United States, the World Bank, and the IMF to privatize many of Bolivia's state-owned industries. Resentment over efforts to privatize Bolivia's natural resources, as well as opposition to a US push to eliminate coca growing, led to the formation of political coalitions cutting across the nation's indigenous and nonindigenous populations and catapulted Evo Morales to victory in the 2005 elections as Bolivia's first indigenous president (Forero, 2005; York, 2006). Such a turn in Bolivia's political landscape created new hope and optimism for a country whose indigenous population had been subject to the false promise that global free trade policies would improve the economy and their lives (Saavedra, 2006; York, 2006). Bolivia's indigenous revolution is a testament to the potential power of social movements to challenge the dominant values of the global economic terrain.

Europe too has seen movements arise in opposition to global trade initiatives. One particularly epicurean example comes from France, where displeasure in the late 1990s over trade policies led to increased resentment of what the French deemed "Anglo-Saxon globalization" (Meunier, 2000). In this case, the heart of the issue was a view that the WTO was a Trojan horse unleashing the "low-brow uniformity of the American lifestyle," a set of cultural norms such as the proliferation of fast food seen to be antithetical to the French way of fine dining (Meunier, 2000). Led by farmers from the Confederation Paysanne (CP), with roots to the May 1968 leftist liberation movement, opposition to WTO rulings brought to the forefront a fusion of agricultural and cultural issues (Meunier, 2000; Morse, 2000) and led to José Bové emerging as a folk hero, when he used a tractor to publicly wreck a McDonald's under construction (Daley, 2000). Taking down the golden arches of globalization was merely a metaphor for the challenge to the larger cultural and environmental consequences of neoliberal globalization.

Although the preceding examples of anti-neoliberal movements are somewhat removed from the university context, this is not to suggest that university actors are bystanders in broad social movements to challenge neoliberal globalization. Indeed, an analysis of the Argentine grassroots rebellion in the wake of the nation's economic collapse of 2001 revealed that many students and faculty from the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) were actively involved in countless protests in the streets known as *cazerolazos*, and in the Movement of Recuperated Companies (Slocum and Rhoads, 2009) – a broad grassroots effort to reclaim factories and place them in the hands of the workers and whose battle cry was rather pointed: "occupy, resist, produce" (Pimentel, 2004). The takeovers were part of a broader challenge to global capitalism, including the role of the IMF in directing Argentine affairs, and a general movement to situate the means of production within the hands of those who typically produce much of the work – everyday workers (Morduchowicz, 2004). UBA students and faculty engaged with community organizers and unemployed workers by offering

relevant expertise and/or organizational skills. In a study of their engagement in the overall grassroots rebellion, many students and faculty revealed a vision of the university as a transformative agent for democratic social change that at times ought to exist in opposition to neoliberalism (Slocum and Rhoads, 2008).

The social movements in Mexico, Bolivia, France, and Argentina all have strong local and national features to them, but the concerns expressed by such movements also resonate globally. This also is the case with the many protests targeting meetings of global economic decision-makers, who have been described facetiously by de Jonquières (2001), and later by Chomsky (2006), as the "masters of the universe," harkening back to the days of Mills (1956) and his critical discussion of the "power elite." Here, we speak of demonstrations held at major meetings involving IGOs such as the WTO and world leaders of organizations such as the G8. Not surprisingly, movements in opposition to global governance meetings are themselves global in nature. Some prominent examples have been protests at the 1999 WTO summit in Seattle, the 2000 IMF–World Bank summit in Washington DC and Prague, the 2001 World Economic Forum in Davos (the meeting of the "masters of the universe," as described by de Jonquières), and the 2001 G8 summit in Genoa (Rhoads, 2003). In many instances, tens of thousands of demonstrators took to the streets in the vicinity of buildings where key meetings were held, to make their anticorporate and anti-IGO perspectives known to meeting participants and to the world in general. The message was loud and clear – global capitalism was not the "natural outcome of contemporary economic relations," but rather represented a purposeful choice by "powerful economic organizations [to] create the climate and context for globalization" (Rhoads, 2003, p. 239). The movements to challenge the "masters of the universe," have, of course, caught the attention of student activists throughout the United States, many of whom travel to participate in protests at major meetings, or host smaller events at their own campuses (Rhoads, 2003). Here again, the potential for the university and its social actors to offer opposition to neoliberal globalization is clear.

Oppositional groups believe there is an alternative to unfettered global capitalism, though they may not necessarily agree on what that alternative is (Burbach, 2002). Their main argument is that in the contemporary environment, corporate interests are unduly influencing global economic policies and therefore the benefits accrued from globalization are unevenly distributed. They also charge that the structural adjustment demands of the IMF and World Bank perpetuate global inequality. From an oppositional standpoint, wealthier nations (mostly Western) continue to be the beneficiaries of global trade policies, often at the expense of developing countries that sink deeper and deeper into poverty and debt. The challenge is determining what should be the set of rules for governing an increasingly global economy, and whose interests those rules should serve. At present, the critique offered by oppositional movements is that policymakers working for powerful IGOs are serving as the authoritarian enforcers of the global order. The antiglobal trade movement and its collective consciousness may therefore be interpreted as a grassroots regulatory mechanism seeking to temper the dominance of corporate interests by calling for greater justice and democracy in the globalization process.

The essence of globalization from below is a belief that citizens around the world can serve as agents of social change. Through local mobilization that incites global empowerment, social movements may be the David to the neoliberal Goliath. Such a possibility suggests an empowered public, understood from Mills' (1956) perspective, as "the seat of all legitimate power," and "the very balance wheel of democratic power" (p. 298). Of course, as Mills argued, such possibilities are increasingly elusive, given that the classic view of an autonomous community of publics arguably has been transformed into a banal mass society conditioned to accept and perpetuate existing structures and conditions by a small group of power elites. Thus, the idea of globalization from below is in some ways a return to a community of publics engaging in democratic struggle, whose ultimate aim is to reclaim sovereignty from the current hegemony of IGOs, transnational corporations, and political and economic elites. Their motto and clarion call may be "no globalization without representation" (Torres and Rhoads, 2006, p. 8).

In today's global environment, and in light of the growing strength of a knowledge-based economy, universities are increasingly recognized for the key role they play in reproducing as well as challenging the dynamics of neoliberal globalization. In other words, universities exist as key institutions both in terms of their support for globalization from above and their engagement in more oppositional endeavors relating to globalization from below. Thus, in what follows, we turn our attention to universities and the growing impact of globalization.

Globalization and the University

It is often difficult to draw distinct lines among the social, cultural, economic, and political dimensions of globalization, and to parse out how various strands impact universities in this country or anywhere else in the world for that matter. Although globalization is clearly a multidimensional phenomenon, economic forms arguably constitute the most powerful force acting on American universities in the twenty-first century. Nevertheless, there are other global forces that are likewise producing significant changes at universities. In what follows, we turn our attention to some of the more general trends related to globalization before focusing specifically on the impact of neoliberalism.

Globally Engaged Universities

Historically speaking, Western universities have always been globally engaged in that they "incorporated tensions between national realities and international trends" (Altbach, 2004, pp. 4–5). The American university is a good example, given that it developed over the years, especially during the 1800s, as a blend of the English colonial college and the German research university (Veysey, 1965). In the present

millennium, however, internationalized notions of the American university tend to connect to issues of globalization and the view that in recent years, perhaps the latter third of the twentieth century onward, internationalization is driven by the growing power of a global economy, global technologies, and transnational communication vehicles.

The fact that globalization has become so pertinent to higher education institutions is in part evident in the discourse of university presidents. In recent years, it has become quite fashionable for institutional leaders to highlight the need for their universities to internationalize their campuses and increase transnational collaborations (Liu, 2007). Such appeals generally involve myriad dimensions and point to the vagueness of globalization as a concept, as well as the expansive influence of global processes. For example, Ruth Simmons, president of Brown University, stated that the "global paradigm" requires universities to "educate students about the global context of their life and work." The chancellor of the University of California (UC), Berkeley, Robert Birgeneau, spoke about the need for students to acquire the "intercultural competence" necessary to "navigate today's globalized society." Additionally, David Leebron, president of Rice University, declared that "in this globalized world a great university is an international citizen," and therefore faculty and students "must benefit from knowledge and ways of understanding that transcend the tendency to parochialism" (Liu, 2007).

In theorizing issues central to internationalization and globalization (Enders, 2004; Knight, 2004; Kwiek, 2000; Marginson and Rhoades, 2002), whether in terms of students, scholars, the delivery of education, or something more abstract such as knowledge itself, what is apparent is that contemporary American universities have ceased to be simply projects of nation-states and arbiters of national identity. Universities therefore have great freedom to pursue wide-ranging activities. As Enders (2004) noted, "[u]niversities are heavily involved in literally every kind of social and economic activity in our increasingly dynamic societies" (p. 363). Complicating this, of course, is the fact that our societies are firmly embedded in global networks, yet national and local conditions remain prominent. That is, while universities increase their global engagement, they also remain simultaneously bound by national and local ties (Marginson and Rhoades, 2002). Therefore, our discussion of globally engaged universities also reveals the ways in which local, national, and transnational dimensions are interconnected and interdependent.

Given the far-reaching impact of global forces, we cannot attend to every feature of globalization's influence on American universities. In order to maintain a degree of cohesiveness, we intend to limit our scope by highlighting some of the more prominent features, mainly in the form of the growing power of a global marketplace and corresponding influences. Hence, we consider various aspects of the international context of American higher education in light of a global marketplace for students and scholars, the internationalization of curricula and pedagogy, changing conceptions of citizenship and the role of universities, the role and relevance of distance education and virtuality, and the multinationalization of universities.

Global Marketplace for Student and Scholarly Exchange

The transnational flow of students and scholars is a complex phenomenon requiring an understanding of particular national and transnational contexts, including most significantly relations of power (Marginson and Sawir, 2005). In terms of the US context, although international exchange certainly is not a new development, many policymakers recognize that full engagement in the present global economy requires an active flow of students and scholars internationally. For faculty, the increasing number of international academic conferences provides them with greater opportunities to travel abroad and foster worldwide research networks, thereby encouraging the development of broader perspectives even though research may be highly specialized (Delanty, 2001). Federal programs, such as the Fulbright Scholar Program, administered by the U.S. Department of State's Council for the International Exchange of Scholars, likewise facilitate the reciprocal flows of academics and emphasize from a national perspective the importance of international educational exchange.

Many universities in the United States recruit students from other countries in order to internationalize their student bodies, while at the same time encouraging US-born students to study abroad at some point during their undergraduate years, so that they might develop forms of intercultural competence and language proficiency beneficial to occupational and civic participation in a shrinking world. An economic incentive also exists for many universities, as international students typically pay full or higher tuition, thereby serving as an important source of revenue. This type of financial consideration has even influenced community colleges, as they likewise turn their attention to the international market for students (Levin, 2005).

Despite the perception of international students as lucrative sources of revenue, the movement of students and scholars has been an important component of the internationalization of universities in the United States as well as abroad, though it remains primarily a "north-south phenomenon," wherein sending nations are predominantly developing countries and receiving ones are mainly industrialized nations (Altbach and Teichler, 2001, p. 7). This leads to concerns regarding "brain drain" from poor to rich countries. For American universities, however, the exchange of students and scholars has been a fruitful endeavor. According to the Institute of International Education (2007), after a significant decrease in the wake of 9/11, the number of exchanges is again on the rise. During the 2006–07 academic year, there were 582,984 international students enrolled at US colleges and universities and 98,239 international scholars teaching or conducting research at US campuses, a 3.0% and 1.3% increase, respectively, from the previous year. Furthermore, the number of American students studying abroad was up 8.5% to a total of 223,534.

Internationalization of Curricula and Pedagogy

Increasing international exchange and the growing vitality of global networks influence university life through the curricular and pedagogical responsibilities of faculty. These collaborations and exchanges are likely to facilitate greater internationalization

of curricula, as professors infuse into their courses and pedagogies a range of global influences. An example of this comes from our own international work, where we found one university in southern China to be undergoing a pedagogical revolution of sorts, as a consequence of Chinese professors studying abroad and the university playing host to growing numbers of foreign instructors (Liu et al., 2007; Rhoads and Liang, 2006). Domestically speaking, one way that American universities have demonstrated their commitment to internationalization is through course offerings that may be part of the general education and/or foreign language requirements (Siaya and Hayward, 2003). More and more, American universities seek to ensure that their students receive some exposure to international issues, events, and cultures (Fischer, 2008). At the University of Minnesota, for example, a revision of its liberal education requirement resulted in the delineation of four theme areas: the environment, cultural diversity, international perspectives, and citizenship/public ethics. Furthermore, in addition to a foreign language proficiency requirement at its College of Liberal Arts, the university offers a foreign studies minor, in which "students must take area studies, language, and intercultural courses as well as participate in a study-abroad program," an international education minor, and a comparative and international development education program (Paige, 2003, p. 57). Other universities across the country have similar offerings on their campuses as they encourage greater global consciousness among their students.

In some ways, however, such curricular forms may amount to nothing more than "intellectual tourism," wherein educators and learners "view their pedagogical and curricular experiences as brief excursions into 'other' people's lived cultures" (Roman, 2003, p. 272). To mitigate such sentiments, Gacel-Ávila (2005) suggested the following:

> [T]he international curriculum should therefore focus on developing in university graduates respect for humanity's differences and cultural wealth, as well as a sense of political responsibility, turning them into defenders of democratic principles of their society, and true architects of social change. (p. 125)

Campuses may strive for such ideals and incorporate them into the institutional strategic plan, but internationalization can also become entangled with globalization such that the internationalization of program offerings is merely an entrepreneurial response to a global market wherein practical application and job relevance drive curricula to be more task-focused. Stromquist (2007), for example, described such developments in the schools of business, communication, and engineering at one west coast university. She wrote:

> [I]nternationalization is found to signify predominantly a search for student markets domestically and abroad rather than positioning the university's knowledge at the service of others in less advantaged parts of the world. (p. 81)

Global Citizenship and the University

With a more internationalized student body and campus curriculum, even if constructed from the perspective of a market ethos, it is quite natural for questions

about global citizenship to arise. The reality is that it is hard to find a university Web site these days that does not in some way address the issue of increased international integration and the emergence of more globally oriented forms of community and citizenship. An analysis of Web sites of universities around the world provides some insight into the global quality of university education and the growing importance that universities place on producing globally minded citizens. (Italics in the following sentences reflect our emphasis.) For example, the University of Melbourne in Australia seeks to prepare students "to contribute effectively to their communities wherever in the *world* they choose to live and work." The University of Guadalajara in Mexico fosters students' holistic development, including increased tolerance and "the love of country and *humanity*," as well as a social conscience grounded in the values of democracy, justice, and liberty applicable around the world. Similarly, the University of Botswana seeks to "advance the intellectual and human resource capacity of the nation and the *international community*" (Rhoads and Szelényi, forthcoming).

A similar discourse can also be found at American universities, particularly in their mission statements. Central Michigan University, for example, aims to "encourage civic responsibility, public service and understanding among social groups in a *global society*." Wittenberg University in Ohio directly "challenges students to become responsible *global citizens*." Likewise, Georgia Southern University strives to prepare its students for "leadership and service as *world citizens*." If nothing else, university leaders and their public relations staffs are quite aware of the growing prominence of international issues and the role universities are expected to play in advancing global relations (Rhoads and Szelényi, forthcoming).

A discussion about global citizenship, however, necessitates some unpacking of the concept. Traditionally, scholars working in the arena of citizenship studies have confined the intellectual terrain to the boundaries of the nation-state. That is, the idea of a citizen was associated with a particular society, which in modern times is essentially defined by the nation-state. Recently, however, the challenge to traditional borders has led to reconceptions of citizenship as postnational, cosmopolitan, or global. For example, Soysal (1994) defined citizenship from a "postnational" perspective in which one's rights and responsibilities are tied to one's personhood rather than rooted in the nation-state.

Extending the work of Soysal in the higher education realm, Szelényi and Rhoads (2007) explored the experiences of international graduate students studying in the United States and identified three common conceptions of citizenship. They described one as "free marketeering," which focuses more on rights and opportunities than responsibilities. Free marketeers are inclined to stress their own opportunities for professional and economic gain in an increasingly global environment. A second notion of citizenship is captured by what they termed "globally informed nationalism," which emphasizes a sense of responsibility to a home country, but is informed by global understandings, in part advanced through study in a foreign country. The final conception, characterized as "global citizenship," centers on a sense of obligation and belonging to a more globally networked view of community and society.

The idea of global citizenship often is embedded in the educational and curricular discourse of universities, as is evident from the few examples we offered from university Web sites. In this regard, Roman (2003) cautioned that from a university perspective, the concept of global citizen is often entwined within a neoliberal curricular framework. The tendency is for universities to articulate the importance of developing global citizenship, without necessarily considering the extent to which they are promoting "intellectual tourists, voyeurs, and vagabonds" (p. 272) or "consumers of multicultural and inter(national) difference" (p. 275). Even with the idea of "democratic civilizers and nation-builders," there are underlying issues of neocolonialism and global inequalities to consider (p. 277). For American universities, then, lauding the ideal of global citizenship may be as much a rhetorical ploy to tap into the worldwide marketplace of students and scholars as it is a desire to prepare its constituents for broader global engagement. Of course, and from a less critical perspective, student demand also is likely to be an essential factor here, as students increasingly seek possible careers in global finance, law, and policy-making. Considered from this perspective, universities may simply be providing a product that they recognize has high market value.

The Role and Relevance of Distance Education and Virtuality

Web-based technology has contributed to the further development of distance education programs and the use of virtual platforms for expanding teaching and learning. Advances in communications technology offer universities considerable opportunities to expand their educational missions and to transcend geography through online learning. The race to establish e-learning ventures by American universities in the late 1990s and early 2000s, many of which were for-profit, such as NYUonline and Columbia University's Fathom, seemed to be a natural reaction to globalization and the ease of technology for surmounting time and space. Their subsequent demise, however, was perhaps an example of profiteering run amok (Carlson, 2003; Carlson and Carnevale, 2001). Nevertheless, a plethora of both for-profit (e.g., Jones International University, Capella University) and not-for-profit (e.g., Virtual University of Pakistan, Michigan State University's Virtual University) campus-less universities exists today to serve students across borders, and in the case of Michigan State, expand the land-grant model of extension to a global field. The various institutions may focus their efforts on different populations of students and some may solely be for commercial purposes (Foster and Carnevale, 2007), but information technology has allowed for greater exchange between industrialized and developing countries as both consumers and providers of virtual higher education. The international marketization of e-learning through virtual platforms is also a powerful component of for-profit universities, including most notably the University of Phoenix. Indeed, the for-profits have used their economic clout to lobby congress for policy changes that affect all postsecondary institutions in the United States (Breneman et al., 2006).

Enabled by technological advances, the globalization of knowledge and communications has resulted in greater access to information, but also greater inequality among nations (Altbach, 2004). The Internet has had a democratizing effect in that it has simplified the process of obtaining information and made academic sources more widely available in a readily retrievable electronic form. However, this has been primarily to the benefit of advanced industrial nations that have the means of paying for the different journal databases and archives offered by multinational publishing and information corporations such as Ingenta, Informa, and Reed Elsevier. Developing countries that have less-networked academic communities and that cannot afford such academic luxuries appear to be falling further behind in terms of their participation in an increasingly knowledge-based economy (Collins and Rhoads, 2008).

The Multinationalization of Universities

The trend for institutions to become global universities may seem like twenty-first-century common sense, but as universities in one country develop multinational collaborations and partnerships with universities in other nations, questions regarding their impact also arise. These multinational "twinning" agreements, such as the ones that the International Center for Applied Sciences (ICAS) at Manipal University of India has with various universities in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia (ICAS, 2008), or the establishment of international branch campuses, such as the one Northwestern University and the Qatar Foundation intend to establish in Education City on the outskirts of Qatar's capital, Doha (Cubbage, 2007), can yield productive transnational exchanges as well as create new higher education opportunities worldwide.

Facilitated by the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the transnational higher education enterprise is booming. Australian and UK universities have long been pioneers in this realm, though the United States is steadily becoming a major player as well (Bollag, 2006). However, the implications of such developments are not yet so readily understood. More research is necessary to fully recognize the impact of exporting the educational programs and services of American universities into international markets. For example, some of the issues concern the following: assessing the capacity of foreign markets, recognition and transferability of credits, and accountability and quality assurance (Lane et al., 2004). Further considerations include balancing educational and business priorities, as well as the cultural appropriateness of curricula (Banks and McBurnie, 1999). The abundance of American institutions running programs and campuses in Qatar's Education City, for example, provides fertile ground for more empirically based research. Furthermore, as the region's other competitor, Dubai's International Academic City, continues its quest to attract American universities (Krieger, 2007), how these educational partnerships play out in the Middle East serves as an interesting case, especially given the different models from which the two cities operate (for the most part, Qatar pays institutions up front while Dubai provides loans).

Without a stronger understanding of the benefits and effects of these overseas endeavors, the perception is that "with few exceptions, a central goal for all of the stakeholders … is to earn a profit" (Altbach, 2004, p. 19). Additionally, given that the majority of branch campuses are run by Western nations in developing countries, there is an added concern that these joint ventures may represent a "union of unequals" such that "when institutions or initiatives are exported from one country to another, academic models, curricula, and programs from the more powerful academic system prevail" (Altbach, 2004, p. 17). A possible concern is that certain universities may operate in a manner consistent with new forms of colonialism, or enact a "new imperialism," as Harvey (2003) described it, and unintentionally or intentionally reproduce antidemocratic and exploitative transnational relations, while seeking ideological, political, and/or commercial gain. The potential for American universities to fall prey to new forms of colonialism, perhaps even while seeking to serve the developing world, returns us to the central concerns of this chapter – the ongoing role of neoliberal forms of globalization and their impact on the American university as well as the rise of social movements that shape universities in response.

Neoliberalism, Global Capitalism, and the University

Although many of the preceding examples connect in various ways to American universities seeking to expand revenue and influence in a neoliberal global marketplace (e.g., creating branch or multinational campuses, seeking to expand revenue through distance education, recruiting international students for revenue purposes), we see several features of the contemporary university particularly tied to globalization from above. These include calls for greater accountability, standardization, and privatization, as well as the growing influence of academic capitalism and a more entrepreneurial view of the university.

Accountability

The call for greater accountability and efficiency in part reflects a shift from a professional sphere to one more political (Huisman and Currie, 2004; Rhoades and Sporn, 2002). What was once a self-regulatory activity facilitated by accrediting bodies has given way to demands for greater public accountability as universities find themselves in the line of fire from legislatures, policymakers, business organizations, and the wider public to produce measurable outcomes of productivity, quality, and demonstrated utility. Essentially, what calls for assessment and accountability demand is that universities prove their worth given the hefty public expenditures that support them. Such calls also come with pressure to improve the efficiency of various university operations. A common example of the push for greater efficiency is the trend for institutional and legislative bodies to raise faculty

teaching loads without corresponding increases in compensation (Levin, 2005; Torres and Rhoads, 2006).

In terms of current US national policy, the accountability rhetoric is similarly found in the Department of Education's 2006 report, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of Higher Education*, commonly known as the "Spellings Report" as it was commissioned by the education secretary, Margaret Spellings. Intended to examine the shortcomings of American higher education and outline ways to improve it, the report offered significant recommendations for developing a "robust culture of accountability and transparency" (p. 20). The report also endorsed high school accountability and state assessments (i.e., high-stakes testing). Directives for higher education tended to stress the need for outcomes-oriented measures, which in turn pose the clear possibility of contributing to greater levels of standardization.

Standardization

Obviously, calls for greater accountability have implications for the standardization of American universities. For example, as accrediting bodies are increasingly pressured by the federal government to better assess student learning (Basken, 2007), complex questions related to what constitutes a meaningful undergraduate education must be considered. In addressing such questions, the conversation inevitably turns to the issue of national competencies and the kinds of outcomes one might expect from a university graduate. It is difficult to imagine such a conversation moving forward at the national and federal level without some push to standardize a university education in more precise ways, an issue that surfaced from time to time among members of the aforementioned Spellings Commission.

Internationally, efforts are likewise underway to measure student learning. The OECD, in particular, is leading the push to create global standards for student learning outcomes (Labi, 2007). Driving this effort is the fact that attempts are already being made to develop standards at the national and regional levels. As part of higher education reform efforts linked to the Bologna process, over 40 European countries aim to create the concept of "European higher education" by converging institutional structures and making them more comparable across countries. Though supporters of the process counter criticism that such an attempt is a movement toward institutional homogeneity through increased standardization, the central goal nonetheless is to create a common framework across nations in order to boost the international competitiveness of European universities, while fostering greater student mobility (Neave, 2003).

In the United States, efforts that may contribute to standardization include the use of standardized outcomes assessment tools to quantitatively determine what exactly it is that students are learning. One example of such a tool is the Collegiate Learning Assessment, which purportedly measures things such as critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication (De León, 2007). The Spellings Report highlighted this instrument in its list

of recommendations that called for attention to meaningful student learning outcomes. Implicit in much of the discourse supporting increased student assessment is a vision of the university as a training center for the broader economy and its key industries, a vision described by Aronowitz (2000) as "higher training" as opposed to "higher learning," and consistent with the idea of the university as "knowledge factory."

Besides institutional assessment standards, standardization is also advanced through particular academic programs and disciplines. American universities play an important role in reforming other higher education systems at a global level as programs and disciplines within the United States increasingly are looked to as models for other parts of the world. For example, legislation in Japan encouraging its universities to open law schools that reflect American-style graduate-level legal education (Brender, 2003) and efforts in Mexico to modify professional preparation programs to more closely resemble those in the United States (Torres and Rhoads, 2006) are illustrative of reforms that result in greater homogeneity across national boundaries.

Privatization

One of the most obvious outcomes of neoliberal globalization is a strong emphasis on privatization, which, in higher education, is characterized by reduced reliance on public funding and an increase in the share of institutional revenue accounted for by nongovernmental sources such as tuition, charitable gifts, corporate donations, and sales of institutional goods and services. From this perspective, higher education is perceived as a marketable product to be consumed, and therefore the price of attendance is best left to market regulation. The economic rationale is that if a college or university prices itself too high, prospective students will seek other less expensive institutions, or if they cannot afford to attend college they likely will seek other noneducation-related opportunities.

Such a viewpoint has great significance for higher education, given that for years American universities, both public and private, have been understood to be engaged in some version of service to the public good. Thus, the resounding call for privatization, including commercialization and corporatization, may increasingly place the university at odds with various segments of the society, given its public charter (Bok, 2003; Kezar, 2004; Marginson, 1997; Newman et al., 2004; Schugurensky, 2006). The demands of the 1960s and 1970s for socially relevant universities have seemingly been co-opted in recent years by a more economic sentiment defining the university as an engine of development to be linked to the industrial and corporate needs of American society. Relevance is still the issue, but the doctrines of global capitalism define relevance in a far different manner from the democratic movements of the past (Morrow, 2006).

From a campus perspective, privatization is visible in many ways, including considerable corporate presence, particularly of food facilities, in student unions and student activities centers across the nation. Perhaps less noticeable are the

assortment of faculty members who have been bestowed the honor of a corporate-endowed professorship. Within the UC system alone, one will find numerous professors carrying corporate titles: UC Riverside has the Bank of America Professor of Education Leadership, UC Irvine has the Taco Bell Chair in Information Technology Management, UC Los Angeles has the Northrop Grumman Chair in Electrical Engineering, and UC San Diego has the Callaway Golf Chair in Structural Mechanics. Such endowed chairs play a crucial role in the recruitment and retention of faculty. They may also represent an accumulation of immense revenue. For example, the fair market value of the 1,378 endowed chairs across the various UC campuses was US$1,615,717,250 on June 30, 2007 (UCOP, 2007). The increased influence of privatization places great pressure on American universities to continually expand revenues and has major implications for scholarship and knowledge production, particularly at research universities.

Academic Capitalism

Neoliberal ideology has helped to produce a new political economy of higher education (Rhoads and Torres, 2006). The trend is toward incorporating market ideals into the teaching, research, and service functions of colleges and universities (Clark, 2001, 2004; Geiger, 2004; Good, 2004; Levin, 2007; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004; Torres and Rhoads, 2006). Indeed, universities commonly portray themselves as existing in a worldwide higher education market, where the key to survival and legitimacy is to globally compete for a portion of the education demand (Wagner, 2004). Students commonly are viewed as consumers, and research and service are business ventures to be managed for their highest economic value. In this regard, traditional ideals of the university, such as liberal learning and advancing knowledge for knowledge's sake, have in many ways taken a backseat to the fetishization of teaching, research, and service as commodities (Bok, 2003).

In response to the uncertainties of the late twentieth century, including the wayward expansion of higher education, increases in student demand, greater public expectations for higher education, and shrinking state and federal expenditures, universities forged a path of entrepreneurialism to cope with the new complexities (Clark, 2001, 2004). Shifting from a social institution logic to an industry logic (Gumport, 2002), the "entrepreneurial university" actively sought innovation in its business practices. As a consequence, given their nature as knowledge-based institutions, universities became deeply entrenched in academic capitalism (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004).

Amidst a rising knowledge economy, a formal theory of academic capitalism emerged to explain the course of action universities took to integrate into a global economy that increasingly views knowledge as the cornerstone of economic development. Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) situated academic capitalism in the context of the "new economy," which they argued is defined by networks of knowledge, interstitial organizations, intermediation between the public and private sector, and

extended managerialism. From this perspective, various university actors – faculty, administrators, academic professionals, students – work in tandem to support the dynamics of academic capitalism.

The framework of the academic capitalist knowledge regime implicates universities in the endorsement of knowledge privatization and profit making, and as a result it encourages individuals, institutions, and/or corporations to claim new knowledge benefits before the public does (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004). Knowledge is considered a private good that has global reach and generates revenue, leading to closer ties between universities and industry. In the age of academic capitalism, it is quite common for universities to experience significant increases in industry-sponsored research, wherein "universities are the sellers and commercial firms the buyers" (Geiger, 2004, p. 182). Academy–industry relations, however, are multifaceted and not wholly good or bad (Anderson, 2001; Hall, 2004). The costs and benefits vary institutionally and by discipline. Costs and benefits also depend on the extent to which extramural relationships are pursued absent conflict-of-interest safeguards.

The turn toward an academic capitalist model of the university is, of course, not without its critics (Washburn, 2005). Schugurensky (2006) stated that the increasing "heteronomous" nature (i.e., disposition to market and state impositions) of universities has led to a declining interest in the common good and the autonomous pursuit of knowledge and truth. A difficulty exists, though, in determining just what constitutes the common good. Schugurensky, for example, posed the following thought-provoking questions: "Do universities have a social responsibility? If so, what exactly does this mean?" (p. 315). Furthermore, in whose interests are universities to act? Whose values are they to reflect? These sorts of questions call attention to the important role of the university in society and why the nature of the university often becomes a battle ground among diverse political and ideological groups seeking to reform it. Questions of social responsibility also point to the growing relevance of social movements, as they become some of the most powerful drivers of university contest and change, including significant efforts to limit the scope of academic capitalism, or at least mitigate its effects. Examples are many and include the actions of students to promote a living wage for all university employees, efforts to offer free tuition for the most economically disadvantaged students, and initiatives to promote open source technology.

The University as a Target of Social Reform

Contemporary universities have long ceased to exist apart from society. The idea of the "ivory tower" or "city on a hill" has been thoroughly vanquished within the context of highly networked global societies. The fact that universities are clearly embedded within the societies in which they exist poses a logical concern about how to define mission and purpose and in whose interests they are to act (Tierney, 1999). For the neoliberal/neoconservative alliance that Apple (2000) described, the

university is recognized as a site of potential opposition to be surmounted. However, reform initiatives come from many directions and from diverse ideological and political groups. For progressives seeking a more democratic university, its traditions, policies, and practices are seen as anything but inclusionary, given a history of limited access for women, the poor, and ethnic minority populations. Many social critics also see the university as largely failing communities in need, and too often engaging in disconnected research and service for the sake of individual and institutional self-interest, including the pursuit of prestige. Because the university is perceived to have failed on so many fronts, this has left it vulnerable to a host of reform initiatives. Along these lines, Santos (2006) argued that rather than providing "justification for a vast politico-pedagogical reform program" to address the various shortcomings of the modern university, instead the problems "were declared insurmountable and were used [by critics] to justify the generalized opening of the university-as-public-good to commercial exploitation" (p. 63). Given the hegemony of neoliberal globalization, the most powerful reform initiatives arguably derive from national and transnational movements working to realign university ideals with a global economic order and the free market.

The reality is that universities have long suffered from crises of identity (Delanty, 2001). However, toward the end of the twentieth century the tensions became more palpable owing to rapid economic globalization and additional sources of social control and influence beyond the nation-state, including IGOs and MNEs. Relying on institutional logic for guidance, universities shifted from their social institution character to their industry form to cope with attacks on their legitimacy (Gumport, 2002; Slaughter, 1990; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). This added to the ascendancy of the market as a driving force in university reform. The market may appear to be a faceless actor knowing no bounds, but it is personified by supranational organizations such as the World Bank and IMF. Santos (2006) and Boron (2006) both pointed to such IGOs as principal architects of contemporary university transformations, especially in the developing world, but elsewhere as well.

Central to Santos' (2006) argument that the university has "transformed into an easy target for social criticism" (p. 73) is what he described as a shift from university knowledge to pluriversity knowledge. Santos noted that university knowledge is homogenous and disciplinary. Scholars set the research agenda apart from society and are unconcerned with how or if knowledge is applied. Pluriversity knowledge is heterogeneous and transdisciplinary. The application of knowledge determines the research to be pursued. In the pluriversity context, both university–industry collaborations and university–civil society partnerships become central to the processes of knowledge production and evaluation. Unilateral ideas of knowledge and society are superseded by interactive and interdependent ones that open up universities to "ultraprivate" pressures to generate knowledge that is economically useful, as well as to "ultrapublic" pressures that demand broader social responsibility. This leads to universities being increasingly subject to destabilizing forces.

Using the general case of Latin American and Caribbean universities, for example, Boron (2006) argued that the privatizing "reforms" introduced by IGOs and their structural adjustment policies have left these institutions incapacitated to respond

progressively to contemporary societal challenges. He re-characterized the adoption of neoliberal educational policies of the late twentieth century as extreme "counterreforms" that regressively transformed universities into beleaguered money-making purveyors of educational commodities bereft of social consciousness. Boron offered a scathing critique of the policies that have affected this region's systems of higher education. Specifically, he noted that the "adoption of neoliberal fundamentalism" (p. 152) resulted in governments abandoning their responsibility to the higher education sector, leaving institutions in a state of financial crisis. Furthermore, as universities became vulnerable to conditionalities imposed by international financial agencies, quality was also jeopardized as a culture of economic reductionism took hold. That is, instead of "heed[ing] the words of Rousseau, Piaget, Vygotsky, and Freire" in assessing educational systems and processes, "the likes of Milton Friedman and the evaluation manuals of the World Bank and the IMF" served as guideposts (p. 157). Boron's work highlights the importance of policymaking and the potential for neoliberal versions of globalization to have deleterious effects for colleges and universities.

The United States, too, has experienced the pressures of neoliberalism to turn universities over to the market. One clear avenue of attack has been to target academic freedom. As Santos (2006) pointed out:

> Academic freedom is seen as an obstacle to the responsibility of the entrepreneurial university vis-à-vis firms that wish to enlist its services. The power of the university must be wrested from the faculty and given to administrators trained to promote partnerships with private agents. (p. 70)

An example of a social movement that challenges academic freedom is the effort launched by David Horowitz, cofounder of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture. Over the past decade, Horowitz helped to create and has promoted the activist group, Students for Academic Freedom, through which he advanced the idea of an academic bill of rights. With funding from large, conservative foundations such as the Sarah Scaife Foundation, the John M. Olin Foundation, and the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Horowitz waged an assault on what he described as the liberal bias of the American university and gained the attention of state legislative bodies around the country. Horowitz found allies in organizations such as the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), a right-wing advocacy group led by Anne Neal and cofounded by Lynn Cheney. The terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001 added fuel to the fire, as a powerful movement to challenge academic freedom, supported to some extent by the U.S.A. Patriot Act, raised questions of patriotism and abuse of professorial power in targeting professors, such as Ward Churchill of the University of Colorado at Boulder, Sami Al-Arian of the University of South Florida, and Miguel Tinker-Salas of Pomona College, among countless others (Rhoads, 2007). What these professors were mostly guilty of was adopting unpopular or critical stances – positions that for the most part were in opposition to US foreign policy. The context of a "perpetual war" (Vidal, 2002b) against unknown enemies who are "here, there, somewhere" (Vidal, 2002a, p. 44), offered solid ground for bringing the American university further in line with the neoliberal/neoconservative alliance.

The work of Horowitz and other like-minded activists can be seen as a response consistent with conservative perceptions that the 1960s and 1970s had yielded too much ground to educational progressivism. Consequently, in contrast to the progressive vision, the rise of Reaganism and Thatcherism offered a neo-vision for turning the university over to the dictates of capital and installing the free market as the ultimate source of social justice. Thus, the American university was to be refashioned in a manner consistent with market forces, while a social interventionist vision stressing education as a means for addressing inequality was redefined as essentially biased and unfair. Indeed, language drawn from the civil rights movement was turned on its head to protect the interests of the most privileged (Rhoads et al., 2005). In the context of the neoliberal university, there is no room for affirmative action or other social programs, as the very idea of government intervention violates the basic principles of neoliberal philosophy. This also is an excellent example of a social movement seeking to transform the university from the right.

The fact that the university has become such a central target of social reform in part reflects the transformative potential of this vital institution. While some seek to control and limit the university's force within society, others, coming from a wide range of political and ideological positions, see the university as a key agent in efforts to advance social change.

The University as an Agent of Social Reform

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) drew from Foucault's (1972, 1980) work on "regimes of power" in describing the "academic capitalist knowledge regime" as a dominant influence on contemporary American universities. They also noted that other, perhaps less powerful, regimes of power exist, and sometimes offer opposition to the dominance of academic capitalism. One such regime may be described as the public-good regime. Concern for a broader social contribution of the university, including service to less-revenue-generating sectors of society, defines key elements of the public-good regime. Ideologically, this regime is associated with various social movements emerging in combination with or having the support of university actors seeking to challenge the various manifestations of neoliberalism and the conservative restoration. Oppositional qualities of the public-good regime raise the possibility of the role of the university as an agent of social reform (Calhoun, 1992; Mansbridge, 1998; Marginson, 2004; Pusser, 2006).

There are numerous examples of the ways students in particular have organized in opposition to the dictates of global capital. Some of the better cases come from outside the United States. For example, the student strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) is illustrative of the ways in which students may come to oppose neoliberal policies and practices (Rhoads, 2003; Rhoads and Mina, 2001). For nearly a year, from 1999 to 2000, groups of students at UNAM took over the campus to resist the implementation of significant tuition fees, partly initiated by pressure from the IMF on the Mexican government to reduce public expenditures for

higher education. Although it may be overly simplistic to suggest that the strike was purely an anti-neoliberalism movement, given the complex set of circumstances that led to its rise and fall, the students' actions nonetheless represented a response to external economic pressures driven by a globally networked society.

The student demonstrators perceived efforts by UNAM's administration to increase tuition as a direct challenge to Mexico's national autonomy and as an obstacle to higher education access and the possibility of social mobility for Mexico's low-income families. As the "nation's university," UNAM's importance resonated across the broader Mexican cultural and political landscape (Ordorika, 2003). Many student protestors believed UNAM to be a public good and therefore opposed what they saw as global pressures pushing Mexico and UNAM toward a privatization model of higher education. The key tension here was primarily over the power of neoliberal economic policies on the one hand and oppositional students holding to a public-good state-supported model of UNAM on the other hand.

Often, university students are joined by faculty in their resistance against neoliberalism. The case of the Argentine rebellion is a good example in that many of the protests in and around Buenos Aires involved groups of faculty and students from UBA and other universities as they marched side by side with countless unemployed and disenfranchised Argentines. The targets of the protesters were the nation's political leaders and the IMF, which for years had held up the Argentine economy as the neoliberal model, only to see it collapse in December 2001. A central call of the IMF in its dealings with Argentine economic and political elites was a push to privatize most public services, including public universities such as UBA. Such initiatives were interpreted by many within Argentina as a direct assault on the university-as-public-good ideal associated with the 1918 Cordoba Movement, wherein elements of the democratic foundations for the Latin American and Argentine university were constructed. The power of the Argentine rebellion eventually enabled newly elected Argentine president, Néstor Kirchner, to adopt a set of policies in opposition to IMF dictates. This in turn contributed to a growing oppositional movement throughout South America. Although this broader movement was not led by universities and their actors, oppositional voices arising at universities within the region have played a major role (Boron, 2006; Slocum and Rhoads, 2009).

Turning to the US context, an excellent example of how universities and university actors engage in opposition to neoliberal ideals is the case of the University of Michigan and efforts of students, faculty, staff, and supporters to preserve affirmative action as a strategy for increasing opportunities for underrepresented minority students. On the one hand, attacks from the right as part of a collective movement to reduce the role of government policy through ending affirmative action on campuses may be interpreted as an example of the university as a target of social reform. On the other hand, the coordinated efforts to preserve affirmative action may be linked to the broad social objectives of the earlier civil rights movement, which were aimed at ending inequality, particularly as defined by race and racism. Hence, we see the case of the University of Michigan as an example of the university playing a vital role as an agent of social change, as it sought to advance and preserve an important social program to diminish inequality.

With the support of a powerful coalition of student organizations, the University of Michigan and its leaders took bold steps to use the university and its resources to fight for the right to consider race as a factor in making admissions decisions for its law school and undergraduate programs. The battle became one of competing social movements. On the one side was a conservative-led movement that included organizations such as the Center for Individual Rights (CIR) and the American Civil Rights Institute (ACRI), along with well-known anti-affirmative action figures such as Ward Connerly. On the other side, in support of affirmative action, were organizations such as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the American Bar Association, the Equal Employment Advisory Council, labor unions, military leaders, and numerous Fortune 500 companies, along with educational associations, including the American Council on Education (ACE). The outcome of the *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger* Supreme Court cases allowed for the continued use of affirmative action. Yet, as a consequence of the *Grutter* decision relating to admission practices at the university's law school, the use of race was so restricted that many colleges and universities dropped such considerations altogether (Rhoads et al., 2005).

A key point here is that the struggle involving the University of Michigan over affirmative action revealed the power of a university and its key actors to engage, perhaps even lead, an important movement aimed at advancing interventionist programs meant to alleviate social inequality, thus offering a clear challenge to the dominance of neoliberalism and efforts to eliminate government policies designed to increase diversity in public universities (Rhoads et al., 2005). Engagement in the affirmative action struggle by the University of Michigan also highlighted the reality that universities cannot so easily disengage themselves from politics, for the case was as much about ideology and value systems as it was about best evidence. In the end, with the same set of empirical facts before all nine justices (in terms of the *Grutter* case), the four liberal-leaning justices voted in favor, the four conservatives voted against, while as was so common with this particular court, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor swung the vote for the pro-affirmative action side.

That the *Grutter* and *Gratz* cases essentially came down to politics and political organizing is not surprising, given that Pusser (2004) documented similar sorts of processes in his study of the battle over SP-1 and SP-2 at the University of California.[2] He explained:

> A public university is a political institution, with great salience, visibility, and instrumental value. By accepting that, we can turn attention to the ways that long-term political action shapes the organization and governance of public higher education. (p. 227)

Pusser also highlighted the reality that universities, in this case public universities such as UC, have key roles to play in forging broader social change: "While the prolonged and often bitter struggle at UC was waged over affirmative action policies at one university, it was also a conflict over the role of elite public universities

[2] SP-1 and SP-2 essentially ended consideration of race, religion, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as criterion for admissions and contracting throughout the University of California.

in the wider society" (p. 227). Although affirmative action has been a major source of political organizing and campaigning in academe, other recent issues such as the war in Iraq, the U.S.A. Patriot Act, a host of environmental concerns, and the use and treatment of laboratory animals also have generated significant political struggle at universities around the country.

In the cases of both the University of Michigan and UC, there was extensive criticism directed at key university personnel for adopting a pro-affirmative action position and engaging in what amounted to a political struggle (of course, there also was much support). Here, it is important to note how quickly university actions in opposition to neoliberalism and neoconservatism are labeled as "politically motivated." Yet when universities engage in an ever-deeper commitment to the neoliberal project, a charge of politicization rarely follows. Indeed, in many ways, neoliberal ideology has come to be so embedded in the contemporary American university that in essence it has become normalized.

Although student actors in particular played key roles in the more localized struggles in Michigan and California, they also have been actively involved in global movements, including trade protests such as the one in Seattle in 1999 (Rhoads, 2003). Whether they are protesting WTO, IMF, or World Bank meetings, organizing unions to protect their interests as a university labor force, striking against tuition and fee hikes, or agitating for democratic rule within particular countries such as Myanmar, the collective consciousness of students serves as a powerful rallying force from which oppositional movements emerge and expand (Rhoads, 1998; Rhoads, 2003; Rhoads and Rhoades, 2005). For example, in recent years, we have seen a great deal of student organizing in support of better wages for university workers, as part of what has been called the "living wage" movement (Madrick, 2001). Such movements are a direct challenge to the emerging institutional emphasis on adopting corporate labor models, often at the expense of employee wages and benefits. In a related contest, graduate student employees at US universities have been actively involved in union drives and general initiatives that may be interpreted as undermining the corporatization of the university (Rhoads and Rhoades, 2005).

Opposition on the part of students, and sometimes faculty, particularly with regard to their view of the university's responsibility to the public good, whether it be in fighting for living wages, affordable tuition, or programs to advance underrepresented minorities, calls attention to Castells' (1997) argument that the influence of global enterprises and their prevailing commitment to privatization and entrepreneurialism seeks to weaken organizations that serve the public good. Under the regime of global capitalism, private interests challenge the public good as they endeavor to corporatize universities. As a consequence, social movements become ever more vital as agents for social change. The university, with its key role in analyzing and conveying social values, paradoxically becomes both the target of social reform efforts to bring the institution into greater alignment with neoliberal values and a vehicle for launching broader social change that at times is likely to be oppositional in nature. The university's potential for oppositional social engagement is key to the conceptualization of the university as a site of social and political contest over the public good and as an essential public sphere (Calhoun, 1992; Mansbridge, 1998; Marginson, 2004; Pusser, 2006).

Implications for Research and Practice

The argument presented here has significant implications for research and practice. With regard to research, there are four key considerations for scholars engaged in the analysis of universities and their relationships to the broader societies in which they exist: consider the changing nature of societies and nation-states; move from organizational theory to social movement theory; center politics and ideology; and problematize globalization as a concept. In terms of practice, there are a number of key points to consider: recognize the university as the inevitable target of social reform; embrace the role of the university as a social reform agent; expand the definition of policymaker; and rethink university service and service learning.

The Challenges to Research

Consider the Changing Nature of Societies and Nation-States

Roughly a century ago, Ferdinand Tönnies theorized that two essential types of social relations had evolved. First published in the late 1800s in Germany as *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, and then later translated as *Community and Society* (1957), Tönnies argued that the idea of *gemeinschaft* reflected the more personalized relations associated with families and close-knit communities, whereas *gesellschaft* was more typical of impersonal relations such as those connected to the industrialization of societies and concomitant labor-related social bonds. Because the basic economic structure of society was evolving from that of cottage industry to a more industrialized model, wherein factories were becoming a dominant site of employment, the very nature of social relations also was being altered. Similarly, the globalization of societies in the context of late capitalism, including the growing power and influence of the corporation, also is producing new forms of society and social relations. For example, the fact that serious consideration is given today to the idea of global citizenship suggests the degree to which globalization is reshaping geographic and social relations.

What this suggests for research in the arena of higher education is that scholars must give greater thought to the ways in which globalization may be altering the landscape of societies, including their relationships with colleges and universities. A central purpose of this chapter has been to introduce some key theorists, such as Castells (1997), Santos (2006), and Touraine (1988), who are helpful for rethinking the nature of contemporary societies and the role of universities in an evolving, knowledge-based, global economy.

The concept of the nation-state is also being reconfigured within the context of globalization. Although many scholars disagree with the argument that the nation-state may be disappearing or fading into oblivion, there is considerable agreement that its fundamental nature is being challenged and reframed by IGOs, NGOs, and MNEs. Carnoy (2006) offers a concise and telling position on the importance of the state for education:

> Most education in most countries is provided by the state … because the state is the supplier and definer of education, the way changes take place in educational systems is largely defined by the political relationship of the nation's citizenry to the state and the way that the state has organized the educational system politically. (p. 555)

Although Carnoy primarily addressed K–12 education, higher education also comes under the province of the state in many ways. The state is the key site for contests over higher education policy and legislation, contests that often are seen as pluralist, yet, as the case of affirmative action clearly reveals, frequently are shaped by social movements (Rhoads et al., 2005). Consequently, researchers engaged in analyses of higher education policy not only need to give greater thought to the state and its role in shaping the context of higher education, but they also must give serious consideration to the ways in which the state is being altered by global processes, including most notably the expansion of neoliberalism as a source of influence. In this regard, scholars such as Chomsky (1999), Giddens (1990, 1998), Harvey (2003), Held (1990), and Said (1993) are theoretically insightful.

Move from Organizational Theory to Social Movement Theory

A focus on globalization, and its impact on contemporary societies, also suggests a rethinking of the foundational theories used to understand social change and its agents. Traditionally, and dating back to such classics as Whyte's (1956) *The Organizational Man*, the study of life in the industrial age was one centered on organizations and their impact on humans and the human condition. So powerful was the influence of the modern organization that studying the human experience beyond the context of common institutions of the time seemed to make little sense. In essence, "modern man" had become a product of a highly organized and institutionalized existence. To a large degree, then, human experience in the modern age was best understood by drawing from various organizational theories and literatures. Classic books such as Blau and Scott's *Formal Organizations* (1962), Kanter's *Men and Women of the Corporation* (1977), Scott's *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems* (1981), Morgan's *Images of Organizations* (1986), Senge's *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (1990), and Bolman and Deal's *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership* (1991) were all, at different points in time, common texts in a variety of social science courses focused on analyzing contemporary organizational life. More specific to the field of higher education, works such as Clark's *The Distinctive College* (1970), Baldridge's *Academic Governance* (1971), Cohen and March's *Leadership and Ambiguity* (1974), and Birnbaum's *How Colleges Work* (1988) have been instrumental in framing our understanding of the organizational nature of college and university life. Although these texts are to this day replete with helpful insights, a new era, a global era, is upon us. There is a need for new insights about the nature of social change and the role of social actors operating at times beyond the confines and limitations of formal organizations. Indeed, scholars will find it increasingly necessary to turn to academic work on social movements to help make sense of the ways in which university actors and groups struggle to forge

social change. This also calls for a return to the basic argument offered by Touraine (1988): that a new sociology of action is needed to replace the former sociology of society, as the notion of society that once undergirded the essentials of sociological thought no longer exists. Globalization has changed modern society, and hence, the theories we use for understanding social change, including the role of universities in society, must also be revised and updated to fit these new times.

This research highlights two key ways of connecting social movement theory to universities: the university as a target of social reform and the university as an agent of social reform. To reform the contemporary American university, an assembly of organizations and actors often is implicated and such a collective may be more easily understood by thinking of it as a social movement. Additionally, universities acting on their own are unlikely to initiate or lead major social changes. Consequently, understanding the role universities play in addressing social issues is likely to require an analysis that moves beyond the limitations of organizational theory and incorporates greater elements of social movement theory and models of the political university.

Center Politics and Ideology

Elevating the importance of social movements as a framework for studying universities as both agents and targets of social reform also raises the importance of politics and ideology. Universities are inherently political in their operations and endeavors, although it is quite common for higher education scholars to ignore the political facets and complexities of university life (Ordorika, 2003; Ordorika and Pusser, 2007; Pusser, 2003, 2004, 2006; Rhoads et al., 2005; Tierney, 1991, 1993). Universities and their leaders also commonly act on the basis of particular ideological orientations, and yet many within academe tend to deny any and all ideological affiliations (Tierney, 1991). Hence, it is in part up to scholars of higher education to bring to light particular value sets and ideologies that inform university operations and decision-making processes. As one example, actions in opposition to the academic capitalist knowledge regime are often attacked for being ideologically driven, while those policies that support the pursuit of capital and revenue streams in academe are rarely described as acting on a particular ideological basis. Rigorous analysis of politics and ideology must account for other such contradictions expressed within academe.

Problematize Globalization as a Concept

There are many aspects of efforts to conceptualize globalization that lead to circularity, and a certain degree of abstraction. To avoid such problems in this chapter, the discussion has centered on the neoliberal vision of globalization. Researchers working in the arena of higher education policy must be as specific as possible when discussing various facets of the global environment that relate to a particular study undertaken. Some helpful typologies, such as those suggested by Torres and

Rhoads (2006), may be useful –globalization from above, globalization from below, cultural globalization, the globalization of human rights, and the globalization of the international war against terrorism (and the globalization of terrorism itself). Although this typology clearly has some limitations – typologies by their nature are simplistic representations that simultaneously serve to include and exclude particular elements – the key point is that scholars need to be as specific as possible in delineating the global circumstances and relations under study. Broadly employing the term globalization may not be of much assistance in many instances.

Challenges to Practice

Recognize the University as the Inevitable Target of Social Reform

Acknowledging the changing nature of society and the increasing importance global processes play in shaping contemporary organizations raises significant implications from a practical standpoint. For one, the growing influence of a knowledge-oriented global economy raises the stakes for universities, given their role in the production and commodification of knowledge, including their participation in cutting-edge scientific discovery. Consequently, universities will increasingly find themselves challenged by groups, organizations, and powerful individuals seeking to restructure them in ways consistent with their own interests. To protect against excessive interventionism, universities need to more clearly articulate what they are and what they intend to become, thereby better positioning themselves to resist efforts aimed at moving them in directions incompatible with their missions.

An excellent example of excessive interventionism that essentially brought the foundation of the university into question is presented by the many accusations of liberal bias made by conservative critics. Universities and their academic leaders often are quick to sidestep such charges. This is somewhat surprising, given that the university traditionally has placed great value on liberal learning in the classic sense and the goal of college and university graduates becoming more tolerant and understanding of others. Also, progress is at the very heart of what universities ought to stand for, as they have an obligation to contribute to improving society. For example, the university as a center of science and knowledge production stands for progress and therefore should inherently embrace progressive values associated with advancing people's lives, improving the human condition, and creating socially just changes within the broader society. Certainly, one can argue that universities have not always lived up to their social responsibilities, but it is difficult to argue that they should not. Given the liberating effects a university education ought to have on students, combined with the goal of making contributions to social progress, why is it so hard to imagine that the university is by nature more liberal than conservative in terms of its political and social vision? Indeed, universities need to be centers for progressive thought and not bastions of support for the status quo. As such, every effort should be made to oppose attempts to limit the potential liberational agency of universities.

Embrace the Role of the University as a Social Reform Agent

In order to fulfill their missions, universities need to be key organizations in broader efforts to transform societies in more democratic and socially just ways. Universities have not always been responsive to the communities, regions, and societies in which they exist, and as a consequence, have become quite vulnerable to external attacks. Lacking the ability to fully resist outside interventions, and facing serious financial constraints, universities became dominated by an ethos of mercantilization. This, for Santos (2006), represents the "new" condition under which many universities operate, but such a state of affairs cannot be met through efforts to return to the "old," or what once was. As Santos argued:

> Under such conditions the new cannot be viewed as the problem and the old as the solution. Besides, what existed before was not a golden age and, if it was, it was just for the university and not for the rest of society, and, within the bosom of the university itself, it was for some and not for others. (p. 82)

The response of the modern university to the neoliberal challenge should not be a return to the ivory tower. Instead, universities must embrace their transformative potential by creating intellectual and critical space for social movements of all types to flourish. A more democratic and emancipatory university is one that recognizes its obligations and commitments to society, but is not defined only by those forces within the society capable of offering it financial support. The public-good vision of the modern university is essential to its survival. This will require increasing engagement with communities and populations in need. The interests and actions of the university cannot be limited to privileging private interests and capital. The university as a public sphere must incorporate the many communities and interests that have a stake in the operations and commitments of these essential institutions (Pusser, 2006).

Expand the Definition of Policymaker

A focus on social movements as a vehicle for engaging universities in the broader struggle for social change suggests a more complex understanding of who are in fact "policymakers." Pusser (2004) put it quite astutely when noting the complexities of the decision-making processes leading to UC's Board of Regents adopting SP-1 and SP-2, thereby ending race, ethnicity, and gender as considerations in making admissions and contracting decisions:

> One of the more powerful findings from this case was the importance of resistance by actors with limited voting power in the policy contest. Most research on higher education policymaking has focused on pluralist processes, or the relationship between institutions and actors who control significant resources. In this case, student resistance, through rallies and protests, cross-campus alliances, and the invitation to Jesse Jackson to address the board on students' behalf, led to a significant shift in the contest. (p. 224).

Pusser's work suggests that policy decisions often are the outcome of complex and dynamic political and social struggles. As such, a wider array of actors actually may hold the potential to impact higher education policy than is typically considered.

There are countless examples of successful efforts either to engage universities as key players in broader social struggles or to target them for reform that had little to do with individuals typically identified as "policymakers." Conventionally, scholars and researchers conceptualize policymakers as state or federal officials charged with overseeing various segments of the higher education arena, or as foundation officers holding the financial wherewithal to shape programmatic development within higher education, or as powerful elected officials participating in various decisions that impact colleges and universities. A focus on social movements, however, complicates this picture. The emergence of ethnic studies as an interdisciplinary academic program is a fitting example. Coming out of the powerful social and political movements of the 1960s, such struggles were able to transform in significant ways the curriculum of countless colleges and universities. This was not accomplished by actors generally defined as "policymakers," but by student and community activists challenging curricular traditionalism and a triumphalist vision of American society (Hu-DeHart, 1993). Consequently, when we consider the ways in which universities are to engage society or the manner by which they become targets of social reform, we must think about the many diverse constituencies that actually play a part in shaping these dynamic processes. Obviously, policymakers come from many corners of the society, and so we must consider them and their potential influence in far more complex ways than we have in the past.

Rethink University Service and Service Learning

Just as the growing importance of social movements suggests new notions of who policymakers may be, so too does it raise considerations with regard to how we think about and define university service. Recognizing that the university should not be subordinate to the demands of neoliberal globalization leads us to consider dynamic ways in which universities and their constituents may become involved in various social movements as an extension of the university's obligation to society. A good example is suggested by the engagement of students and faculty at UBA in their nation's grassroots movements opposing neoliberalism (Slocum and Rhoads, 2009).

Typically, university leaders see it as quite fitting for key faculty and staff to engage in various forms of economic development, involving, for example, the commercialization of university products and services, including the generation and application of knowledge and scientific discovery. It is also customary for faculty in a school of business to work with local or regional business entrepreneurs to develop new and innovative enterprises. University professors in these areas might even find ways to engage their students in forms of service learning or internships beneficial to various businesses or corporations. But does the academy afford all professors the same opportunity to connect students' academic studies to relevant civic and community engagement? Would the actions of a labor studies professor engaging her students in support of a union drive by campus cafeteria workers be seen in the same light as the entrepreneurial engagement of business students?

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is far more acceptable to support an entrepreneurial economic development mission, which itself represents particular

ideological and political assertions, than to engage in activities in opposition to neoliberalism. This leads us to ask: To what degree are contemporary university actors able to offer resistance to the neoliberal project? Can the university in the United States truly create space for service such as that evidenced by the oppositional engagement of UBA students and faculty participating in the Argentine grassroots rebellion? To do so, universities need to do a far better job of expanding conceptions of service. The fact that such mission-related and public-service-oriented projects might seem oppositional says a great deal about the extent to which neoliberalism has come to define the modern American university (Giroux, 2002).

Conclusion

Globalization has shaped, and will continue to shape, the modern university in significant and multifaceted ways. Furthermore, because global processes are also refashioning the very nature of societies, the manner by which we go about constructing the relationship between universities and the societies in which they exist is also changing. More specifically, social movements play a growing role in the ways in which higher education policy is constructed and advanced. The days of a single president or even a “small cadre” of devoted academic leaders forging institutional sagas (Clark, 1972) are increasingly numbered, as the complexities of knowledge-based network societies bring an array of social actors into the fray of higher education policy making and the very nature of what colleges and universities represent.

From a scholarly perspective, any discussion of global forces interacting with the contemporary university must begin and end with acknowledgement of the massive influence of neoliberalism and its power over the world economy. That the university has become highly commercialized is likely irreversible (Bok, 2003). And despite the many challenges it presents, there certainly are facets to commercialization that may be desirable – such as forcing the university to be more responsive to external constituents. A global economy shaped by neoliberalism is a dominant force of our time. However, as has been demonstrated throughout this chapter, there are innumerable spaces for university actors and social movement participants to engage in, and lead, oppositional endeavors. The modern American university must remain vibrant and vital across broad sectors of society.

Finally, the research presented here suggests that it is possible to link the contemporary American university to the power of social movements, in recognition of the university’s obligation to serve a democratically negotiated public good. Such a goal at times will bring the university into conflict with neoliberal forms of academic capitalism and the commercialization of university teaching, research, and service. That tensions will arise is inevitable, but universities equipped to support a range of endeavors, representing diverse philosophical viewpoints, will be better positioned to excel in a global environment where essential challenges are likely to arise from near and far and from many different ideological and political positions.

References

Alberoni, F. (1983). *Falling in love* (L. Venuti, trans.). New York: Random House.
Altbach, P.G. (2000). The crisis in multinational higher education. *International Higher Education*, *21*, 3–5.
Altbach, P.G. (2001a). Higher education and the WTO: Globalization run amok. *International Higher Education*, *23*, 1–4.
Altbach, P. G. (2001b, May 11). Why higher education is not a global commodity. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *The Chronicle Review*.
Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management, 10*, 3–25.
Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized university. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 5*, 5–25.
Anderson, M. S. (2001). The complex relations between the academy and industry: Views from the literature. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*, 226–246.
Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York: Routledge.
Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
Bakan, J. (2004). The *corporation: The pathological pursuit of profit and power*. New York: Free Press.
Baldridge, J. V. (1971). *Academic governance: Research on institutional politics and decision making*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
Banks, M., & McBurnie, G. (1999). Embarking on an educational journey – the establishment of the first foreign full university campus in Malaysia under the 1996 education acts: A Malaysian-Australian case study. *Higher Education in Europe, 24*, 265–272.
Barber, B. (1995). *Jihad vs. McWorld: How globalism and tribalism are shaping the world*. New York: Ballantine Books.
Basken, P. (2007, November 30). U.S. review of accreditors may produce a showdown [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(14), A1. Retrieved November 27, 2007 from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v54/i14/14a00102.htm.
Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Blau, P. M., & Scott, W. R. (1962). *Formal organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing.
Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Bollag, B. (2006, February 17). America's hot new export: Higher education [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(24), A44. Retrieved February 10, 2008 from http://chronicle.com/weekly/v52/i24/24a04401.htm.
Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Boron, A. A. (2006). Reforming the reforms: Transformation and crisis in Latin American and Caribbean universities. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 141–163). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Boron, A. A., & Torres, C. A. (1996). The impact of neoliberal restructuring on education and poverty in Latin America. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research* XLII (2), 102–114.
Brender, A. (2003, June 4). 74 universities in Japan hope to open graduate-level law schools [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 10, 2008 from http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/06/2003060404n.htm.

Breneman, D. W., Pusser, B., & Turner, S. E. (2006). The contemporary provision of for-profit higher education: Mapping the competitive market. In D. W. Breneman, B. Pusser, & S. E. Turner (Eds.), *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-profit universities* (pp. 13–44). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Burbach, R. (2001). *Globalization and postmodern politics: From Zapatistas to high-tech robber barons*. London: Pluto Press.

Burbach, R. (2002). “Throw them all out”: Argentina’s grassroots rebellion. *Spotlight*. Retrieved January 3, 2008, from http://www.redress.btinternet.co.uk/rburbach9.htm.

Calderone, S., & Rhoads, R. A. (2005). The mythology of the “disappearing nation-state”: A case study of competitive advantage through state-university collaboration. *Education and Society, 23*(1), 5–23.

Calhoun, C. (1992). Introduction: Habermas and the public sphere. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 1–50). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Carlson, S. (2003, January 17). After losing millions, Columbia U. will close online-learning venture. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 49(19), A30.

Carlson, S., & Carnevale, D. (2001, December 14). Debating the demise of NYUonline: Did the venture go under because of the changing economy or bad decisions? *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 48*(16), A31.

Carnoy, M. (1993). Multinationals in a changing world economy: Whither the nation-state? In M. Carnoy, M. Castells, S. S. Cohen, & F. H. Cardoso (Eds.), *The new global economy in the information age: Reflections on our changing world* (pp. 45–96). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Carnoy, M. (2001, June). The demise of the nation-state. *Theoria*, *97*, 69–83.

Carnoy, M. (2006). Rethinking the comparative – and the international. *Comparative Education Review*, *50*, 551–570.

Castells, M. (1997). *The power of identity*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Chomsky, N. (2006). A world without war. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 39–59). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Chua, A. (2004). *World on fire: How exporting free market democracy breeds ethnic hatred and global instability*. New York: Anchor Books.

Clark, B. R. (1970). *The distinctive college*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

Clark, B. R. (1972). The organizational saga in higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *17*, 178–184.

Clark, B. R. (2001). Creating *entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Clark, B. R. (2004). *Sustaining change in universities: Continuities in case studies and concepts*. Berkshire, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.

Cohen, M. D., & March, J. G. (1974). Leadership *and ambiguity* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Collins, C., & Rhoads, R. A. (2008). The World Bank and higher education in the developing world: The cases of Uganda and Thailand. In D. P. Baker & A. W. Wiseman (Eds.), *The worldwide transformation of higher education* (pp. 177–221). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Cubbage, A. K. (2007, November 7). Northwestern to launch communication, journalism programs in Qatar [Media Release]. Retrieved January 11, 2008, from http://www.northwestern.edu/newscenter/stories/2007/11/qatar0.html

Daley, S. (2000, July 1). French turn vandal into hero against U.S [Electronic Version]. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from http://query.nytimes.com/gst/full page.html?res=9E0CE4DB1439F932A35754C0A9669C8B63

de Jonquières, G. (2001, January 24). Power elite at Davos may be eclipsed by protesters. *Financial Times*, p. 18.

Delanty, G. (2001). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge society*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

De León, A. G. (2007, Fall). The collegiate learning assessment: A tool for measuring the value added of a liberal arts education. *Carnegie results*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education, 47*, 361–382.

Fischer, K. (2008, February 21). Colleges may face challenges in realizing greater internationalization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*. http://chronicle.com/daily/2008/02/1751n

Forero, J. (2005, December 19). Coca advocate wins election for president in Bolivia [Electronic Version]. *The New York Times*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from http://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/19/international/americas/19bolivia.html

Foster, A., & Carnevale, D. (2007, April 27). Distance education goes public. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(34), A49.

Foucault, M. (1972). The *archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge* (C. Gordan et al., trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Gacel-Ávila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*, 121–136.

Geiger, R. L. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the market-place*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1998). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review*, *72*, 425–464.

Good, M. L. (2004). Increased commercialization of the academy following the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 48–55). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Gumport, P. J. (2002). Universities and knowledge: Restructuring the city of intellect. In S. Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect* (pp. 47–81). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hall, S., & Jacques, M. (1990). Introduction. In S. Hall & M. Jacques (Eds), *New times: The changing face of politics in the 1990s* (pp. 11–20). London: Verso.

Hall, Z. W. (2004). The academy and industry: A view across the divide. In D. G. Stein (Ed.), *Buying in or selling out?: The commercialization of the American research university* (pp. 153–160). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Held, D. (1990). The decline of the nation state. In S. Hall & M. Jacques (Eds.), *New times: The changing face of politics in the 1990s* (pp. 191–204). London: Verso.

Held, D. (1991). Editor's introduction. In D. Held (Ed.), *Political theory today* (pp. 1–22). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Holton, R. J. (1998). *Globalization and the nation-state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hu-DeHart, E. (1993). Rethinking America: The practice and politics of multiculturalism in higher education. In B. W. Thompson & S. Tyagi (Eds.), *Beyond a dream deferred: Multicultural education and the politics of excellence* (pp. 3–17). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Huisman, J., & Currie, J. (2004). Accountability in higher education: Bridge over troubled water? *Higher Education, 48*, 529–551.

Institute of International Education (IIE). (2007). Open doors 2007: Report on international educational exchange. Retrieved February 10, 2008, from http://opendoors.iienetwork. org/

International Center for Applied Sciences (ICAS). (2008). About twinning programs. Retrieved January 11, 2008, from http://www.manipal.edu/manipalsite/Users/Colsubpage.aspx?PgId=582&ID=1&collegeId=24

Johnston, H., Laraña, E., & Gusfield, J. R. (1994). Identities, grievances, and new social movements. In E. Laraña, H. Johnston, & J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity* (pp. 3–35). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
Kellner, D. (2000). Globalization and new social movements: Lessons for critical theory and pedagogy. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 299–321). New York: Routledge.
Kellner, D. (2002). Theorizing globalization. *Sociological Theory, 20*, 285–305.
Kezar, A. (2004). Obtaining integrity? Reviewing and examining the charter between higher education and society. *The Review of Higher Education, 27*, 429–459.
Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*, 5–31.
Krieger, Z. (2007, October 4). Dubai sets its sights on becoming international education hub [Electronic Version]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved October 4, 2007 from http://chronicle.com/daily/2007/10/2007100402n.htm.
Kwiek, M. (2000). The nation-state, globalization and the modern institution of the university. *Theoria. A Journal of Social and Political Theory, 96*, 74–99.
Labi, A. (2007, September 19). Quest for international measures of higher-education learning results raises concerns. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*, from http://chronicle.com/daily/2007/09/2007091903n.htm?=attn
Lane, J. E., Brown II, M. C., & Pearcey, M. (2004). Transnational campuses: Obstacles and opportunities for institutional research in the global education market. In J. E. Lane & M. C. Brown II (Eds.), *Unique campus contexts: Insights for research and assessment* (pp. 49–62). New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 124. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.
Levin, J. S. (2005). The business culture of the community college: Students as consumers; students as commodities. In B. Pusser (Ed.), *Arenas of entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit institutions compete* (pp. 11–26). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 129. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Levin, J. S. (2007). Neoliberal policies and community college faculty work. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research: Vol. XXII* (pp. 451–496). New York: Springer.
Liu, A. (2007, November). *State of the university: Presidential perspectives and twenty-first century institutional mission*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Louisville, KY.
Liu, A., Rhoads, R. A., & Wang, Y. (2007). Chinese university students' views on globalization: Exploring conceptions of citizenship. *Chung Cheng Educational Studies, 6*(1), 95–125.
Luke, A., & Luke, C. (2000). A situated perspective on cultural globalization. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 275–297). New York: Routledge.
Madrick, J. (2001, July 5). Economic scene: Battle over living wage heats up. *The New York Times*. http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/Ðpslm/livingwage/originalpage/07_05_nyt.html
Mander, J. (2006). Introduction: Globalization and the assault on indigenous resources. In J. Mander & V. Tauli-Corpuz (Eds.), *Paradigm wars: Indigenous people's resistance to globalization* (pp. 3–10). San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.
Mander, J., & Tauli-Corpuz, V. (Eds.). (2006). *Paradigm wars: Indigenous people's resistance to globalization*. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.
Mansbridge, J. (1998). On the contested nature of the public good. In W. W. Powell & E. S. Clemens (Eds.), *Private action and the public good* (pp. 3–19). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Marginson, S. (1997). *Markets in education*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
Marginson, S. (2004, September). Doing somersaults in Enschede: Rethinking and inverting public/private in higher education amid the winds of globalization. Keynote paper presented at the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers (CHER) conference, Enschede, The Netherlands.
Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance, and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, *43*, 281–309.

Marginson, S., & Sawir, E. (2005). Interrogating global flows in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education, 3*, 281–309.
Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (1999). Critical pedagogy, postmodernism, and the retreat from class: Towards a contraband pedagogy. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole, & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Postmodernism in educational theory: Education and the politics of human resistance* (pp. 167–202). London: Tufnell Press.
McLaren, P., Hill, D., & Cole, M. (1999). Postmodernism adieu: Towards a politics of human resistance. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole, & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Postmodernism in educational theory: Education and the politics of human resistance* (pp. 203–213). London: Tufnell Press.
Meunier, S. (2000). The French exception [Electronic Version]. *Foreign Affairs*, *79*(4). http://www-stage.foreignaffairs.org/20000701faessay65/sophie-meunier/the-french-exception.html
Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Morduchowicz, D. (2004, September 20). The take: A review [Electronic Version]. *ZNet*. http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/7824
Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
Morrow, R. A. (2006). Critical theory, globalization, and higher education: Political economy and the cul-de-sac of the postmodernist cultural turn. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. xvii–xxxiii). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Morrow, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (2000). The state, globalization, and educational policy. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 27–56). New York: Routledge.
Morse, D. (2000). Striking the golden arches: French farmers protest McD's globalization [Electronic Version]. *The Progressive Populist*, *6*(14). Retrieved January 3, 2008, from http://www.populist.com/00.14.morse.html
Neave, G. (2003). The Bologna declaration: Some of the historic dilemmas posed by the reconstruction of the community in Europe's systems of higher education. *Educational Policy, 17*, 141–164.
Newman, F., Couturier, L., & Scurry, J. (2004). *The future of higher education: Rhetoric, reality, and the risks of the market*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Ohmae, K. (1996). *The end of the nation state: The rise of regional economies*. New York: Free Press.
Ordorika, I. (2003). *Power and politics in university governance: Organization and change at the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*. New York: Routledge.
Ordorika, I., & Pusser, B. (2007). La máxima casa de estudios: The Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico as a state-building university. In P. G. Altbach & J. Balán (Eds.), *Empires of knowledge and development: The roles of research universities in developing countries*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Orfield, G., Bachmeier, M. D., James, D. R., & Eitle, T. (1997). Deepening segregation in American public schools: A special report from the Harvard project on school desegregation. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 30*(2), 5–24.
Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E. E., & Lee, C. (2002/2003). The resurgence of school segregation. *Educational Leadership, 60*(4), 16–20.
Paige, R. M. (2003). The American case: The university of Minnesota. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7*, 52–63.
Pimentel, L. (2004, October 8). The take [Electronic Version]. *PopMatters*. http://www.popmatters.com/film/reviews/t/take-2004.shtml.
Pusser, B. (2003). Beyond Baldridge: Extending the political model of higher education governance. *Educational Policy, 17*, 121–140.
Pusser, B. (2004). *Burning down the house: Politics, governance, and affirmative action at the University of California*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Pusser, B. (2006). Reconsidering higher education and the public good: The role of public spheres. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Governance and the public good* (pp. 11–27). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reich, R. B. (2007). *Supercapitalism: The transformation of business, democracy, and everyday life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). Quality assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and political economic framing of higher education policy. *Higher Education, 43*, 355–390.
Rhoads, R. A. (1998). *Freedom's web: Student activism in an age of cultural diversity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Rhoads, R. A. (2003). Globalization and resistance in the United States and Mexico: The global Potemkin village. *Higher Education*, *45*, 223–250.
Rhoads, R. A. (2007). The new militarism, global terrorism, and the American university: Making sense of the assault on democracy "here, there, somewhere." *InterActions*, *3*(1), article 2.
Rhoads, R. A., & Liang, X. (2006). "One coin has two sides": Global influences and local responses at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies. *World Studies in Education*, *7*(2), 23–53.
Rhoads, R. A., & Mina, L. (2001). The student strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico: A political analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, *45*, 334–353**.**
Rhoads, R. A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of the U.S. research universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *76*, 243–275.
Rhoads, R. A., & Szelényi, K. (forthcoming). *Global citizenship and the university: Cases from around the world*.
Rhoads, R. A., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2006). *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Rhoads, R. A., Saenz, V., & Carducci, R. (2005). Higher education reform as a social movement: The case of affirmative action. *The Review of Higher Education, 28*, 191–220.
Rikowski, G., & McLaren, P. (1999). Postmodernism in educational theory. In D. Hill, P. McLaren, M. Cole, & G. Rikowski (Eds.), *Postmodernism in educational theory: Education and the politics of human resistance* (pp. 1–9). London: Tufnell Press.
Ritzer, G. (1993). *The McDonaldization of society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Oaks Press.
Roman, L. G. (2003). Education and the contested meanings of "global citizenship." *Journal of Educational Change, 4*, 269–293.
Saavedra, T. (2006, January 10). Bolivia: The rise of Evo Morales [Electronic Version]. *Frontline/World Dispatches*. Retrieved March 9, 2008, from http://www.pbs.org/ frontlineworld/blog/2006/01/bolivia_the_ris_1.html
Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
Santos, B. de Sousa (2006). The university in the 21st century: Toward a democratic and emancipatory university reform. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 60–100). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Schugurensky, D. (2006). The political economy of higher education in the time of global markets: Whither the social responsibility of the university? In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 301–320). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Scott, W. R. (1981). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. M. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
Slaughter, S. (1990). *The higher learning and high technology: Dynamics of higher education policy formation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slocum, J., & Rhoads, R. A. (2009). Faculty and student engagement in the Argentine grassroots rebellion: Toward a democratic and emancipatory vision of the university. *Higher Education 57*, 85–105.

Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of citizenship: Migrants and postnational membership in Europe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*, 81–105.

Szelényi, K., & Rhoads, R. A. (2007). Citizenship in a global context: The perspectives of international graduate students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review, 51*, 25–47.

Tierney, W. G. (1991). Ideology and identity in postsecondary institutions. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Culture and ideology in higher education* (pp. 35–57). New York: Praeger.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Tierney, W. G. (1999). *Building the responsive campus: Creating high performance colleges and universities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tönnies, F. (1957). *Community and society: Gemeinschaft und gesellschaft* (C. P. Loomis, trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

Torres, C. A. (1998). *Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Torres, C. A. (2002). Globalization, education, and citizenship: Solidarity versus markets? *American Educational Research Journal, 39*, 363–378.

Torres, C. A., & Rhoads, R. A. (2006). Introduction: Globalization and higher education in the Americas. In R. A. Rhoads & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 3–38). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Torres, C. A., & Schugurensky, D. (2002). The political economy of higher education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective. *Higher Education, 43*, 429–445.

Touraine, A. (1988). Return *of the actor: Social theory in postindustrial society* (M. Godzich, trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

UCOP (2007). *Annual report on university private support 2006–07*. University of California Office of the President, University Affairs, Institutional Advancement.

Urry, J. (1998). Contemporary transformations of time and space. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 1–17). Buckingham, UK: Open University.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education*. Retrieved February 10, 2008, from http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/ list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Vidal, G. (2002a). *Dreaming war: Blood for oil and the Cheney-Bush junta*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Vidal, G. (2002b). *Perpetual war for perpetual peace*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Wagner, P. (2004). Higher education in an era of globalization: What is at stake? In J. K. Odin & P. T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 7–23). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.

Washburn, J. (2005). *University, inc.: The corporate corruption of American higher education*. New York: Basic Books.

Whyte, W. H., Jr. (1956). *The organizational man*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

York, S. (2006). Bolivia's indigenous revolution. In J. Mander & V. Tauli-Corpuz (Eds.), *Paradigm wars: Indigenous peoples' resistance to globalization* (pp. 187–193). San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books.

View publication stats