



PROJECT MUSE®

The Higher Education We Choose: A Question of Balance

Gary Rhoades

The Review of Higher Education, Volume 29, Number 3, Spring 2006,
pp. 381-404 (Article)

Published by The Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: [10.1353/rhe.2006.0015](https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2006.0015)



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/rhe/summary/v029/29.3rhoades.html>

The Review of Higher Education

Spring 2006, Volume 29, No. 3, pp. 381–404

Copyright © 2006 Association for the Study of Higher Education

All Rights Reserved (ISSN 0162-5748)

ASHE PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

The Higher Education We Choose: A Question of Balance

Gary Rhoades

In this article, my 2004 presidential address to the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), I speak to four interrelated streams of my research, which can be integrated to express the title of my address, “The Higher Education We Choose: A Question of Balance.”

I write from the disciplinary standpoint I did 25 years ago when I applied for a postdoc with Bob Clark. I write as a sociologist, whose work focuses on how institutions, professions, and choices in education policy and practice are structured by the political economy, in the United States and globally. Now, thanks to Bob, I write as a higher education scholar who applies his sociological lens to colleges and universities. The research that I present here addresses patterns and structures in four realms: (a) the strategic

GARY RHOADES is Professor and Director at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, Tucson. This article is based on his presidential address at the Association for the Study of Higher Education conference, Kansas City, November 2004. Address queries to him at the College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721; telephone (520) 621-0947; fax: (520) 621-1875; email: grhoades@email.arizona.edu.

Acknowledgements: Scholarship is the product of a community. And so many members of this community have informed my work. Fabulous students (like Joan Hirt, Jeni Hart, Amy Metcalfe, and many others), immediate colleagues (like Larry Leslie, who hired me, and Sheila Slaughter, whose work continues to inspire me, and the current crew at the Center for the Study of Higher Education—John Cheslock, Jenny Lee, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, and Doug Woodard—my international college of correspondents and confidants, and the “whiskey seminar” of ASHE colleagues. And so many members whose work I’ve read and benefited from. I thank all of you, as well as Janet, Elizabeth, and Olivia, who help me keep that community in perspective.

orientation of colleges and universities (and units within them) and their intersection with the economy; (b) the structure of professional employment and organization of production in these institutions; (c) social movements of employees to challenge and offer alternatives to current directions; and (d) some professionals' outreach to schools to facilitate pathways into the academy for underrepresented populations.

However, I also write as a practitioner who makes choices. I make choices when I seek to influence the strategic orientation of my academic unit, institution, or not. When I choose to align and work with groups in and outside of higher education seeking to reshape the academy. When I participate in personnel decisions. When I argue for or decide whether or not to admit or give financial aid to this or that student, emphasizing this or that criterion. I make choices when I decide what service to engage in. For instance, I am involved with faculty associations and unions such as the American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association, and the American Federation of Teachers, not with associations of administrators, state executive officers, or governing boards. My work with faculty groups is scholarly. But it is also professional practice, trying to shape public policy by inserting myself in debates about strategic direction, conditions of work, intellectual property rights, and contingent faculty.

Higher education is not just a set of structures that we confront. With our work and our choices, as aggregates of individual actions and/or enacted through our involvement in various collectivities, we perpetuate and change such structures. Our choices shape and constitute professional practice and the educational system. We are the system of higher education. Like so many in ASHE, I believe that higher education scholars should engage in policy-relevant research. Unlike most, I do not hold higher education scholarship as separated from policy and practice. Regardless of how few highly placed policymakers read and utilize higher education scholarship, higher education scholars are policymakers, implementers, consultants, and practitioners (and members of larger groups or social movements). We move between the roles of scholar and practitioner and are directly implicated in the political, economic, and cultural dynamics of our society and higher education system. As part of a powerful cultural institution we articulate and promote particular discourses, and we make, legitimate, critique, and suggest alternatives to higher education policy and practice in what are inherently political acts.

The four areas of my research are connected to the main theme of the 2004 ASHE conference: "The Spirit of *Brown v. Board of Education*: 50 Years Later." In featuring the *Brown* theme, I want to focus on the ongoing issue of access, relating it to higher education issues about strategic direction, professional employment, and professional activity in colleges and universities. After some years of progress, in recent decades the system has experi-

enced growing stratification of access—and of success—between students from lower and higher socioeconomic backgrounds, and among students of different ethnicities and genders. Although my research is not on access per se in a traditional sense, I want readers to see that the patterns I study are related and that they contribute to sharpened stratification: academic capitalism and the new economy (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004); managerial professionals and a Mode III form of production (Rhoades & Sporn 2002; Rhoades, 2004); core contingent faculty who are collectively organizing (Rhoades & Maitland, 2005; Rhoades & Rhoads, 2003; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005); and outreach projects oriented to the social cycles of overlooked and underserved communities (Rhoades & Moll, 2004).

The issues before us are not either/or choices. They are questions of the balance of investment among multiple options, often pursued at the same time. I believe that our colleges and universities, and our higher education systems are out of balance. I think we need to recalibrate and redress that balance. In my conclusion, I suggest that, as individuals, collectivities, and organizations, we should make choices (and connect with collectivities) more like those modeled by Rudy Pasternak than like those evident in the current directions we are headed.

To dramatize my address's basic themes, I developed a seven-minute digital video and audio presentation using images and music that are part of U.S. popular culture to give concrete expression to abstract themes about how choices in academe are connected to opportunity and change in society.¹ For reasons of cost, length, and technology, the traditional journal format is not hospitable to images and sound. So in spots I describe aspects of the video in text.

The video, like my speech, is framed by the *Brown* case, but also by the more expansive push to make education and society more inclusive. *Brown* was about public schools—perhaps its most enduring image being one in the video of Little Rock High School in Arkansas, which was the site of a celebrated struggle between the federal and state government to integrate public education. Yet it was a central part of a civil rights movement that impacted higher education, in court cases before and after *Brown*, with another enduring image of the struggle between the feds and a southern governor on the steps of Ol' Miss to integrate that university.

¹Dr. Amy Scott Metcalfe helped produce this video and offered her creative insights about several aspects, including technology and organizations, benefiting my work enormously. The technical work was done by Juliana Piccillo, an adjunct faculty member at the University of Arizona. Music ideas were contributed by Rebecca Debenport, a higher education graduate student at Arizona. Despite globalization and U.S. media dominance, there is still a specificity to images and music that define a country's cultural landscapes and that may be unfamiliar to international readers.

In those civil rights movements—whether of African Americans (as captured in Martin Luther King Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech or in the violence surrounding school busing in northern cities like Boston), of Latinos (or in the Chicano movement, as portrayed by Cesar Chavez, and the push, along with Asian Americans, for bilingual education), or of women (as portrayed by Gloria Steinem)—education was a focal point.

Indeed, students and faculty were important actors in these movements. The renowned Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) organized various protests such as the lunch counter sit-ins in the South. Student civil rights workers were “freedom riders,” filling buses in the North that then headed South where they would work—and in some cases, die—for voter registration. A faculty member from City College, New York, psychologist Kenneth Clark, was key to the *Brown* case. Key activist roles were also played by (eventual) professors Derrick Bell and Vine Deloria, Jr., an American Indian activist and academic who helped create and define the field of American Indian Studies. In the women’s movement, activist women faculty’s research on the gender gap in salaries and on comparable worth had profound policy significance in academe and beyond. More recently, consider the public policy significance of public debates and higher education policy changes surrounding the actions of female science faculty at MIT and other universities and the public statements and actions of Harvard president Lawrence Summers.

ASHE itself consists of many members whose work spans academic, practitioner, and activist roles in regards to civil rights movements. Members have played significant roles in the Adams State desegregation cases in the South (some testifying for the feds and the HBCUs, others testifying for the states and predominantly White institutions), in the recent Michigan cases, in cases related to immigrants’ educational rights, in the gay rights movement and policy changes on campuses, and in struggles surrounding women faculty’s pay and conditions of work.

One theme of my address, “The Higher Education We Choose,” is that the boundaries between academic, practitioner, and change agent are hard to delineate: We are active players in our higher education system, and our choices, as individuals and as members of larger groups and social movements, matter. Another underlying theme is that, collectively, higher education is making choices that run counter to the spirit of *Brown*, that we are out of balance, expressed in the video in the theme song of the movie, *Koyaanasqatsi*, a Hopi word meaning “a life out of balance.” The opening music was Aaron Copland’s *Fanfare for the Common Man*, expressing for me the grand purpose of American higher education, which is to make a college education available beyond the elite and upper middle-class sectors of society.

The dialogue from Stanley Kubrick's film, *2001: A Space Odyssey*, closing the first section of the video speaks to the structures that thwart that purpose: the astronaut saying, "Open the pod bay doors, Hal" to the computer (representing "the system") that runs the spaceship, which intones, in a calm, monotone voice, "I'm sorry, Dave. I'm afraid I can't do that." Yet I believe such structures can be changed. Much of higher education today seems to be following a path identified in Led Zeppelin's classic rock ballad, "Stairway to Heaven," about a woman who believes that "all that glitters is gold" and that she can buy her way into heaven. However, I believe that, individually and collectively, we can (and I hope that we shall) overcome that, and that, in the words of "Simple Gifts," the Shaker song ("Tis the gift to be simple, 'tis the gift to be free, / 'Tis the gift to come down where we ought to be"), we can choose to change our current direction and come down closer to where I think we ought to be.

With that background, let me turn now to the four streams of my research.

ACADEMIC CAPITALISM AND THE NEW ECONOMY

The book that Sheila Slaughter and I wrote, *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (2004), builds on but goes beyond Sheila and Larry Leslie's (1997) book on academic capitalism. We focus on the policy regime that supports, encourages, and subsidizes investment and entrepreneurial activity in new economy fields of research and modalities of instruction. We focus on all types of nonprofit higher education in the United States and on educational and other forms of entrepreneurial initiatives and activities beyond patenting. And we develop a theory about the organizational changes and restructuring that are involved with academic capitalism and the new economy.

Academic capitalism is not simply a matter of entrepreneurial colleges and universities seeking to generate more revenues in tight financial times. It's a matter of these not-for-profit institutions behaving more like private enterprises, as the relationship between public and private entities shifts. A set of public policy structures supports what we call an academic capitalist knowledge/learning/consumption regime. This is not privatization. It is a shift of public subsidy to entrepreneurial activities, especially in new economy realms. And it is a shift in the regime of policies and incentives, at the federal, state, institutional, college, and departmental levels.

Academic capitalism should not be confused with the idea that all or even most academic institutions are successful, independent, privately financed capitalist enterprises. They are not. Many, if not most, entrepreneurial colleges and universities are unsuccessful in generating the revenue they aspire to. And many, if not most, also accumulate major costs in the process

that are in many ways frequently state subsidized. Patents and technology transfer are one example. The top 15 to 20 institutions are generating net revenues—sometimes very significant revenues—from these efforts. But most of the remaining almost 200 institutions involved are running in the red, accumulating significant costs in the aspiration to realize large, and arguably largely unattainable, for them, revenue gains. They are gambling on long shots.

Similarly, in copyrighting and educational materials (e.g., distance education courses, educational modules, and course packages), recent years have seen the academic equivalent of the dot.com bust. Some prominent, well-resourced universities undertook major for-profit distance education ventures, seeing potential profits in various copyrighted educational materials. They invested tens of millions of dollars in these initiatives. Several of these enterprises—for example, FATHOM at Columbia University—have essentially gone bankrupt. Interestingly, one success story, the University of Maryland's University College, gets considerable public monies; its major contractor is the Department of Defense.

In our book, we track intellectual property policies at federal, state, and institutional levels. At the federal level, we trace a systematic, bi-partisan push for universities and colleges to become more market oriented. At the institutional level, because we are also interested in copyright and educational materials, we focus on a national sample of public and private research universities, of doctoral and master-granting universities, and of community colleges.

Looking at the patent policies in six states (California, Florida, Missouri, New York, Texas, and Utah) of 18 institutions (an elite public, elite private, and non-elite public in each), and at a national sample of more than 300 collective bargaining agreements, we find increasingly aggressive colleges and universities seeking to capitalize on faculty's intellectual products. Early policies covered faculty members, but later policies include students, even undergraduates. Over time, institutions claim a greater share of the intellectual property proceeds. There is a reduced range of exceptions (e.g., professors creating the property on their own time) to institutions claiming ownership. The policies of some states and universities now allow for the institution to invest in the equity of spin-off companies created by current faculty members. Finally, there is enormous growth in the internal managerial capacity of colleges and universities to develop and profit from patents and technology transfer (e.g., an expansion of technology transfer offices in 1980s).

The emergence of copyright policies came later for most institutions. But here as well, institutions have become more aggressive in pursuing their claims to the products of faculty work with increasingly broader coverage (though still less than for patents) in the policies of who is included. There is

increased use of “work for hire”/”within the scope of employment” language, which gives universities and colleges greater claim to the property. Further, references have increased to “substantial use of institutional resources,” a condition that generally affords institutions greater property claims. And there is increased internal managerial capacity to commercialize copyrightable educational materials and courses.

The policy regime we see as ascendant in these shifts, relative to the continuing Cold War regime, is organized around the new, service/information economy, of which educational services and commodities are a central part. Big, academic science was largely spawned by and was a central player in the Cold War, captured in the video with images of Sputnik, Gemini, and the space race, the production of nuclear weaponry (captured by a photograph of a nuclear aircraft carrier with sailors lined up in an $E=mc^2$ formation), and the Vietnam War, in which the academy was implicated even as it was a site of protest against the war, ROTC, CIA campus recruitment, and classified military research. If anything, the academy is even more central to the new economy.

Ironically accompanied by the music of “Simple Gifts,” images in the video invoke cloned animals (we open our book with the story of a research effort at Texas A & M University to clone the pet dog of a donor—and later cats, and then of bigger antlered deer for hunting), genetically engineered foods, and higher education’s commitment to improving life with science and technology.

New economy information and instructional technologies are increasingly present in higher education, in research and instruction. The academy creates and promotes, and is a major consumer of these technologies. An emblematic formula here is $E \text{ learning} = 24/7/365$: student customers have round-the-clock, all-year-long access to service providers. New conceptions of work and time (and of learning—as in “learner centered instruction”²) have worked their way into our lexicon, with the phrase “24/7.” Access in the new economy is a matter of time and place-based convenience, not of social stratification, an ironic conversion given the digital divide of socio-economically and ethnically stratified access in the information economy.

Yet academic capitalism and the new economy is an effort to not only intersect and tap into, but also to organize and play in the new economy. An example is the universities’ leading role in establishing Internet2. Presidents of 34 universities started Internet2 in 1996 in partnership with corporate CEOs, many from telecommunication companies. One of its explicit aims

²As a satirical historical note on the claims that new technologies facilitate interactive “Learner Centered Teaching,” the video image here was a photo of viewers watching a film wearing 3D glasses, which reportedly let viewers feel they were more actively engaging the images.

was to rapidly diffuse technologies to the commercial world, in contrast with the first-generation internet, which focused on defense, education, and research. True, presidents of many of the same universities were involved in its development—but not as the leaders. Rather, they collaborated with the Department of Defense and some defense contractors. Universities are leaders, then, in organizing and producing the information economy. They are creating the backbone of the postindustrial economy, the nodes through which the information economy operates, a quite different role than they played in regard to the backbone of commerce in the industrial economy—railroads.

Academic capitalism and the new economy is a global phenomenon. But it has local impact in shifts in patterns of activity and investment among fields and levels of research and instruction, within colleges and universities. Thus, one of our chapters focused on the strategic orientation of 134 department heads in public research universities. We found restratification in universities not only between science, engineering, and most of the rest of the campus, but also *within* science and engineering. That restratification matches the change in the external political economy from a Cold War to an information-based economy. As one math head said, “When the evil empire died, we came upon hard times. Weapons are down.” A physics head made a similar comment. This pattern of restratification was concisely expressed in a presidential letter to the faculty at my own institution three years ago, which announced that, if the 20th century was the century of high energy physics, the 21st was the century of biotechnology and biomedical sciences. In other words, the new economy has focused on different fields from the old economy. That shift has involved investing and reallocating resources within colleges and universities on the basis, not simply or primarily of traditional merit or productivity, but rather of fields’ perceived market potential. For example, life science units have sometimes been recipients of internally reallocated monies from the central administration, even when they were not very strong academically.

Another pattern we identified on campuses was educational entrepreneurialism. Many units were developing “professional master’s degrees,” thesis-free master’s programs that were designed as money-making degree programs in which students would pay full tuition plus additional fees of which the department would retain a share. A major target population was people in business. One engineering head said, “It’s a separate program. I get a check every fall for 10–20K.” Such master’s degrees were also evident in basic science departments. And it was evident that college administrators were seeing the revenue potential of such degrees as well. Two heads complained that, despite the success of their master’s programs, they could get no new resources: no fellowships, no faculty lines. The college wanted them to generate more revenues. The new would-be cash cows in big public universities are the professional master’s degrees.

Academic capitalism also involves a distinctive strategic orientation regarding students. Elite public and private institutions are increasingly recruiting and marketing to students who can afford to pay more. As Roger Geiger (2004) in his new book, *Knowledge and Money*, and Michael McPherson and Morton Shapiro (1998), in their old one, *The Student Aid Game*, have shown, these institutions are moving more financial aid to more privileged students. And as Sandy Astin and Leticia Oseguera (2004) have shown in a recent *Review of Higher Education* article, freshmen classes in all sorts of institutions are coming from increasingly privileged backgrounds. Sheila and I agree.

The pattern of focusing on students who can pay more also applies to community colleges, which are increasingly recruiting and enrolling international students who pay far higher tuition than do local residents. Community colleges are also increasingly responsive to contract education for companies and their employees. Fewer resources are devoted to historically underrepresented populations of students. That's academic capitalism and the new economy.

Sheila and I offer several constructs to frame a theory of how academic capitalism and the new economy works. First is the idea of new circuits of knowledge. Knowledge is being developed and disseminated through new mechanisms and networks that go well beyond the academy—e.g., technology transfer, copyrightable educational materials, courseware platforms that standardize teaching, and the infrastructure of the knowledge economy. Second, interstitial structures have emerged within colleges and universities to manage the new activities we have discussed—e.g., technology transfer offices, economic development offices. Third, there is a proliferation of organizations that mediate between public, private, and not-for-profit sectors. Examples are the Internet2 consortium and Educause, in her study of which Amy Metcalfe (2004) developed the concept of intermediating association. Finally, there is extended managerial capacity within colleges and universities, an investment in infrastructure and personnel, to engage in the work of academic capitalism. That is a topic to which I now turn.

MANAGERIAL PROFESSIONALS

Very little work has been done on the fastest growing category of professional employee on college and university campuses—support professionals in the lexicon of national datasets, or what I have called managerial professionals (Rhoades, 1998a; Rhoades & Sporn, 2002). These are personnel with advanced degrees who are neither faculty nor senior administrators—most of the students we prepare in most higher education programs. Faculty are no more than about 30% of all personnel on campuses and 55% of professionals, down from 65% just two decades earlier.

Managerial professionals have professional associations, journals, and bodies of technical knowledge. But despite their claims to expertise, they do not enjoy the relative autonomy held by professors. Managers, not peers, hire, evaluate, and fire them. They lack academic freedom, and they have no claims on the intellectual property they manage and, in some cases, create. In sum, they are more connected to and dependent on managers than faculty members are.

Yet managerial professionals are more than an increasing administrative cost. They are increasingly involved in key activities from assessing quality and ensuring accountability to providing student and consumer services to facilitating the production of instruction and research to engaging in entrepreneurial activities. They are key players in academic capitalism.

These personnel are very much involved in intersecting with the private sector. For example, in the area of faculty development they work with intermediating associations such as Educause and with private enterprises such as Blackboard, both of which feature and represent the significance of new information technologies. The use of these new technologies offers an opportunity structure on which to build professional claims. Thus, managerial professionals in teaching centers and faculty development units emphasize the use of instructional technologies as a way to advance their claims to pedagogical expertise. The language of “learner-centered” education and instruction decenters faculty and centers the new professionals.

There is an international dimension to this pattern. Barbara Sporn and I (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002) have noted how the growth of these managerial professionals in the United States represents a shifting mode of producing research, teaching, and service in higher education. This same mode of production is emerging in the European Union (EU), though in differing ways in different European countries. There are alternative possibilities to this pattern, embedded in the strength of professors in European higher education systems and in the practice of seconding professors to serve in positions that non-professorial professionals are filling in the United States. Yet the European push to compete with the United States—expressed in part through the Bologna Process of moving in Europe toward establishing common degree structures in higher education like those of the United States (i.e., bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate)—is taking the continent toward a U.S. model.

Academic capitalism involves a new mode of production. It is a new configuration of professional personnel, in growing numbers of part-time, non-tenure-track, contingent faculty, as well as of full-time managerial professionals. In an NSF-supported grant, I am focusing, with Sheila and Jennifer Croissant, on technology-enhanced instruction in research universities. We are exploring the emergence of what we are calling a Mode

III form of educational production, a term that follows Modes I and II, as types of knowledge or research production (Gibbons et al., 1994). Three of the factors that distinguish these forms are that Mode I is discipline based, versus being transdisciplinary; Mode II focuses on applications that go beyond single disciplines. Second, Mode I is centered in fixed, academic sites (discipline-based academic departments) versus in organizational settings (e.g., centers and institutes) that in Mode II can be reconfigured. Third, Mode II is a problem-centered form that is attuned to the logic of application in the real world, rather than being driven by an internal, discipline-based logic.

Yet there are several current conditions and developments that the Gibbons et al. model does not address. Modes I and II speak to the production of research, while Mode III also speaks to the production of instruction and to the packaging of educational products for widespread consumption, as instruction becomes a new economy service to be delivered. Moreover, Gibbons et al. do not address patterns of power that are related to the new economy and the academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. Although Mode II is centered in the logic of application in society, that logic is not connected to any specific set of interests, groups, or structures of power and privilege in society. Further, our conception of Mode III goes beyond the idea of interdisciplinary teams of academics to address managerial professionals, focusing on matrices of academics, technicians, and managerial professionals involved, for instance, in developing, delivering, and supporting on-campus and distance/distributed, technology-enhanced instruction. Thus, Mode III is not flexible teams in constantly reconfigured organizational units; rather, it involves investment in permanent managerial capacity and organizational infrastructure, thereby increasing capital costs and shifting labor costs toward managerial professionals.

I offer the example of the organization underlying two undergraduate classes, studied in our project (Croissant, Slaughter, & Rhoades, 2003) to capture some of the reality of what we see as a new mode of production emerging in the academy. Our research design has been to start with classes in three fields, in three universities, and at three educational levels (lower division undergraduate, upper division, master's). We treat courses and professors as case studies in the use of technology in instruction, partly because of the enormous complexity of the personnel, practices, and entities surrounding the use of technology. In coding our interviews with professors and the documents surrounding related to particular courses, we are exploring the themes and rhetoric about instruction and curriculum, and we are also mapping the matrix of technical and professional staff and entities involved in instruction at these particular sites.

Despite the prevailing view of professors as techno-incompetents or technophobes, many professors in each of the fields we are studying (an-

thropology, biology, and chemical engineering) are quite sophisticated in their use of instructional technologies. I offer brief sketches of two professors from the same university and in the same department. They can be seen as archetypes, or ideal types, representing phenomena and choices we are studying.

The first course is “The Elements of Chemical Engineering,” a lower division course at a public research university. The professor has an elaborate website for the class that he has constructed over the years, drawing on the assistance of graduate students, teaching assistants, and undergraduates. Available on this webpage are self-assessment instruments, practice exams, interactive materials, study guides, hyperlinks, and more—an impressive variety of web-based materials. This professor has received two grants (from NSF and Intel) to develop these materials.

Although this faculty member has constructed his own website for the class, not using the campus’s WebCT platform, various infrastructures support him, the course, and its students. The college has a computer lab available to all undergraduates from which they can get technical and other course-related assistance. The department also has a specialized computer lab for students who have completed two prerequisite classes. The professor belongs to an Engineering Research Center, funded by the NSF and partner businesses and universities; he has consulted with its technical and educational professional personnel in developing and supporting the course. And the university has a computing center separate from the two labs mentioned above.

The second course is “Microelectronics Manufacturing and the Environment,” a combined undergraduate/graduate class in chemical engineering. Most of the class material is on PowerPoint slides, and the course has a sophisticated website developed by the professor. Like his colleague, he uses neither WebCT, which much of the campus uses, nor Blackboard, which the university’s business school uses, nor the platform developed by a faculty member who is now the campus’s chief information officer. So although some professors develop their own materials and sites, the campus offers an elaborate technical infrastructure, some of which the university contracts for with new economy enterprises, some of which the university invested in as an entrepreneurial effort, and all of which is supported by nonfaculty personnel.

The second professor is part of the same Engineering Research Center as the first one. He is also a member of a professional development consulting firm, Semizone, which markets and delivers online courses for semiconductor industry personnel in modular format. I mention the Semizone affiliation partly to highlight the connection between the university and specific external economic enterprises and interests. I also mention it because four of the videotapes for this professor’s lectures in his university course (one-

fourth of his curriculum), are modules that are also sold through Semizone. Indeed, his syllabus indicates that students can purchase their personal copies of the tapes. In short, the organization and format of this course are structured by its configuration in modules that are packaged for commercial distribution. It is a clear case of how commodification is expressed in and shapes the curriculum. This professor's perspective about curriculum is partly conveyed by the fact that the first page of his syllabus has a copyright mark. For this professor, his educational materials are intellectual property that have commercial value. And the character and form of commodities in the marketplace are reflected in the curriculum he constructs. That is an interesting contrast with the first professor, who is also linked to private sector support, but for whom the instructional technologies and materials seem to be imbued more with educational than commercial meaning, purpose, and value.

Of course, using high technology in instruction need not translate into treating curriculum as a commodity—at least, not on the part of the individual faculty member. In that sense, there is a choice. But the university to which these faculty members belong has an intellectual property policy that affords the university a claim to ownership of educational materials created with substantial university resources, consistent with the pattern mapped in our book. Moreover, the potential revenue to be generated from such activities has affected universities' investment in managerial professionals and new information technologies. Thus, for all the possibilities of individual choices, there are also structures of power embedded in a Mode III organization of production that express the values and material realities of new economy academic capitalism.

In closing this storyline, let me point out the multiple modes of production that are at play and the stratification among them. The courses are discipline based: Mode I structures continue to be basic units of instruction. Layered on top of them are other structures (e.g., the Engineering Research Center) that reflect a Mode II as well as a Mode III organization in that they have nonfaculty personnel who affect instruction. Because of patterns of external funding, such personnel and Mode III structures are more present in some fields than others. Further, there are various Mode III structures at the college and university level.

Thus, there are multiple infrastructures at different levels of the university involved in producing instruction, each local level with personnel and structures that support and facilitate technology-enhanced instruction. The extent of the infrastructure varies by college and department: less is found in units with higher numbers of students from underrepresented populations, units in the social sciences, humanities, and education. That heightened stratification among academic fields and populations of students, is another aspect of academic capitalism and the new economy, and another reason

that it is important to speak of a Mode III form of knowledge production and dissemination that is more connected to some groups and interests than others, and that privileges some and disadvantages others.

Part of the Mode III organization of instruction is this local infrastructure and its managerial professionals. Part of it is also regional and national networks of professionals and entities in public and private sectors, like Semizone. These networks foster the potential for an international production and distribution of instruction and curriculum for commercial purposes. That is what we see as Mode III, in *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*.

CORE CONTINGENT FACULTY, COLLECTIVELY ORGANIZING

The concept of a mode of production is a good segue to the recent focus of my work on unionized graduate employees (Rhoades & Rhoads, 2003; Rhoads & Rhoades, 2005) and on part-time faculty who are unionizing (Rhoades & Maitland, 2005). For all the fascination in the industrial economy with machines and in the new economy with information technologies, there is much political struggle over what these economic transformations mean for employees (and for society). There is also much negotiation over the terms and conditions of work in these regimes and in political struggles that are connected to patterns of access to and success in higher education.

A central question in the debate about graduate assistants is: Are they employees whom universities are using to do the work of the institution, or are they apprentices whom universities are training? Despite universities' explicit invocation of the metaphor for the archetype entry-level person in the feudal economy, many individuals and groups engaged in the debate use metaphors of the industrial economy instead. For example, former graduate union leaders Deborah Herman and Julie Schmid have co-edited an excellent book entitled, *Cogs in the Classroom Factory* (2003). The title draws on our very powerful images of industrial machinery and what it can do to workers, expressed in my video in the image from the classic silent film *Modern Times*, of Charlie Chaplin being run through the cogs of industrial machinery.

But I would take issue with the industrial metaphor because we are in a postindustrial economy. Assembly line (and unionized) employment has declined. In the new economy, the archetype employee is the low or no benefit, part-time, or contingent worker. With academic capitalism and the new, information-based economy, education is a service, a product—not a process—to be delivered, sometimes virtually. It is increasingly technology centered. Education, learning, and wisdom are transformed into information to be processed by the customer. In this context, graduate employees,

particularly teaching assistants, like part-time and non-tenure-track, full-time faculty members, are contingent, just-in-time employees, delivering a service.

Calling such employees contingent, however, overlooks their increasingly central role in production processes in the academy, in instruction and research. So I am calling them “core contingent” faculty: they are central to the academy’s core activities, and they are an increasingly large proportion of the academic workforce. In lower division undergraduate instruction, these faculty and graduate assistants deliver the bulk of instruction, both in two-year and four-year colleges and universities. And they are increasingly collectively organizing.

Despite such growth and the size of the unionized workforce, what I wrote a number of years ago (1998b) continues to apply: “One can read much higher education literature and not discover that faculty unions exist” (p. 10). Yet faculty and graduate employees are among the most heavily unionized workforces in the U.S. economy: more than one-third of faculty, 30% of campuses, and nearly two-thirds of public sector faculty and institutions. Although we know much about full-time faculty as demographic aggregates, we know far less about them as members of unions and/or as agents of social change. As for contingent faculty and graduate teaching assistants, there is even less work. With the exception of Judy Gappa and David Leslie (1993) writing on part-time faculty, Roger Baldwin and Jay Chronister (2001) on full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, and Ann Austin and Donald Wulff (2004) on graduate students, we know little about these personnel.

The prevailing view of and research on faculty members comes from surveying faculty members about their time allocation (between research and teaching) or studying their salaries, as a function of demographic characteristics and productivity (e.g., Perna, 2002; Toutkoushian, 1998). In focusing on faculty employees’ time on tasks and on their pay and productivity, we are adopting an old industrial-economy managerial perspective. Out of that perspective comes a truism in our discourse: Faculty care more about research than teaching. This a curious finding, as most faculty prefer teaching and engage primarily in teaching. And, as even if the trend line in preferences is toward more research, on average, faculty even in research universities spend considerably more time on teaching than on research (Milem, Berger, & Day, 2000).

In contrast, Jenny Lee, John Cheslock, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, and I (2005) review these individualistically focused literatures. We speak to the significance of studying faculty as knowledge workers in the new economy, of addressing them as a new economy workforce and examining their collective activities, in a larger national and global context. Academic capitalism and the new economy is reconfiguring academics as knowledge

workers globally, and fostering new patterns and networks of collective organization and activity.

If we look at the faculty from this perspective, a different picture emerges. We see growing numbers of core contingent faculty who are very much committed to instruction. We see these employees increasingly organizing collectively, with a public agenda of recentering instruction and investing in working conditions for all instructional personnel that contribute to quality education. Moreover, we see that these core contingent faculty, like faculty unions nationally, are calling higher education and society to invest in fulfilling the democratic promise of access to and the public good purposes of higher education as an institution. They are questioning some of the economic ventures (and costs) of academic capitalist enterprises.

That sort of analytical focus is what drives my work with Rob Rhoads on graduate employee unions. We are interested in what mobilizes these employees as agents of change. We have explored what collective identities and ideologies they forge, and we have addressed cases of different local bargaining units, across the country. Our research has revealed some important differences among and within units in their orientation toward bread-and-butter versus activist agendas and also between the leadership and larger membership of the bargaining units.

Yet there are some critical commonalities in the graduate employee unions, partly because they are part of a larger social movement. A rallying issue is health insurance, which is simultaneously both a basic bread-and-butter issue and also a defining political struggle about social justice in our time: Do the terms of employment in the new economy include basic health benefits? Another commonality we have found is the challenge to universities to focus increased resources on undergraduate education, particularly liberal arts fields that are at the heart of general education but that are increasingly on the perimeter of academic capitalism.

The point is that academic capitalism in the new economy is not an inexorable, unopposed trend. Organized challenges to this tendency work toward rebalancing the academy. If individually, many faculty members, particularly in research universities, care more about research than teaching, nevertheless unionized faculty are collectively critiquing and challenging what academic capitalism does to teaching and education. Moreover, they are championing an increased investment in instruction, and to broad access to higher education.

I tried to express this point in the video with images representing important social movements that have challenged global corporate capital and shifted public discourse and policy in significant ways. To the tune of Crosby, Stills, Nash, and Young's classic ballad about protest, "For What It's Worth" ("There's something happening here; / What it is ain't exactly

clear. . . / Young people speaking their minds; / Getting so much resistance from behind”), I offered scenes of the World Trade Organization protests in Seattle, in which the graduate employee union at the University of Oregon participated. Subsequent images showed such successful protests and social movements as Students Against Sweatshops (calling attention to exploitative labor practices in the Third World by companies like Nike) and the environmental movement. Faculty and students have been very much a part of these social movements, which have impacted higher education.

Studying faculty’s activism can encompass more than studying unions. It can mean studying women faculty’s activism (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Hart 2005). It can mean studying faculty’s collective struggle to establish gay rights (Dilley, 2002; Tierney, 1997). And it can mean doing as Ben Baez (2000) writes about and lives—as do so many faculty of color: race-related service that engages groups outside the academy and seeks to change the academy.

The prevailing perspective on faculty members fails to capture the social change role that academics play as part of larger collectivities, in and outside of the academy. In some sense it depoliticizes faculty members, by treating them as individual professionals and employees, in terms of their narrowly circumscribed professional productivity and reward. In doing so, higher education research adopts a perspective that is implicated in structures of power embedded in the political economy of higher education. Yet faculty members are not only individuals, employees subject to colleges and universities, or professionals in pursuit of career advantages. They are also, individually and in various collectivities, political actors and change agents who in various ways effect reforms in academic organizations by virtue of their political and academic work.

A SOCIAL CYCLE APPROACH TO EDUCATION OUTREACH

Faculty are not the only professionals seeking to reorient the academy. There are also managerial professionals, seeking through outreach programs to open the pod bay doors of access to higher education for historically underserved populations. Two such professionals at the University of Arizona’s Education Outreach Office developed a semester-long program in 2003 for parents of upper elementary schoolchildren in a district where more than 80% of the students are Latino and on free or reduced-fee lunch programs. Lori Tochihara and Arlene Benavidez have called it the College Academy for Parents program (CAP). It is premised on early intervention and parent involvement as mechanisms for increasing students’ success in education and entry into universities. It is also premised on the idea that these students are not an impending “tidal wave” (as they are characterized

in California) that threatens to wash us away and which must be managed, but rather that they are an opportunity to invest in the future.

The role of such managerial professionals to work collectively in enhancing the access of underserved populations is all the more remarkable given the current political climate and discourse outside the academy. For some years, politicians (and the courts) have been chipping away at federal and state policies aimed at expanding access to the point where the lexicon now is of “reverse discrimination,” not of affirmative action. As emphasized in my video, this “Tidal Wave II” has a particular tinge to it, especially in the Southwest. It is brown (as expressed in the sign held by Latino protesters in the video, “We are not dirty Mexicans”). Amid the backlash movement against a wide range of “liberal” policies, it is impressive that many managerial professionals in various student service offices sustain their commitment and expand their programming to work toward greater social access to higher education. They do so not just as individuals; a key part of their collective professional ideology and identity is an ethic of social justice and of intentional, active efforts to expand access for underrepresented populations.

There is much higher education research on undergraduates in four-year colleges, who have come there directly out of high school. There is also a large literature on college choice, which points to the sharp stratification of application and access to different types of higher education institutions (Hurtado et al., 1997). We have much less literature exploring the extent to which, and how successfully, higher education institutions reach out to, recruit, and enroll a more diverse student body. (For key exceptions, see Rendón, Novack, & Dowell, 2005; Tierney & Jun, 2001.)

My role in the College Academy, in conjunction with my colleague Luis Moll and our graduate students, has been to interview parents before and after the semester-long program of weekly presentations by university faculty and staff. Our interviews with 45 parents in the first cohort indicate that the program has successfully enabled parents, to—in their own words—see the university as a real possibility for their children. One important question is: Can that reality be sustained over time and translated into university entry? It is true that parents are very pleased with the program, that it slightly expanded their social capital and networks, that it gave them ideas about how to help their students with homework, and that it provided information about financial aid and applying to college; however, the effects appeared to be relatively superficial and perhaps temporary. Our recommendation has been that the program develop mechanisms for ensuring sustained involvement—social cycles of interaction between the program and the parents over time. Too many parents are not fully aware, even after the program, of the varied higher education choices their children have and of the implications of and relationships among those choices.

For all the research that is done on students, scholars pay too little attention to the distinctive paths of low-income and minority students. In an unsuccessful grant proposal, two colleagues, Marie Elena Reyes and Terry Woronov, and I sought to track the progress of women of color in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM fields) as they enter community colleges, move through those colleges, transfer to a university, and then either graduate or move on to graduate school. Based in part of Marie Elena's experience in working with such students, we posited that many of these students who persist tend to follow a circuitous path. They move in and out of higher education at various points in time. Thus, the common metaphor of a pipeline, which connotes a steady, linear flow from high school to university to graduate school, does not capture this movement, so we offered a social cycles approach instead. We suggested that the paths of women students are linked to social cycles in their lives, including those related to finances and work, extended family responsibilities, and childbearing and child-rearing cycles. Furthermore, their choices are shaped by social considerations about the field and the work it leads to. We proposed to construct a longitudinal data set of cohorts of women as well as to develop case studies, following smaller groups of students for at least a decade to determine the extent to which and the ways in which their paths were circuitous ones. We believe that, to sufficiently understand the persistence of underrepresented women, studies must track them for at least 8 to 10 years. And to adequately measure the educational success of colleges and universities, we should study not just graduation rates, but also movement into graduate school and the workforce.

David Lavin's (1996), *Changing the Odds*, on the CUNY open-access experiment, offers one model. Lavin tracked cohorts of students as they moved through the two- and four-year schools of the CUNY system and into the workforce for 10 years beyond their college entry. The open-access students graduated at lower rates. But Lavin judged the experiment a success in that it expanded a middle class of color in New York City. He considered the social cycles of the students and the social impact of the higher education system on the local economy.

To return to the Education Outreach program: It has been a success with the community. Other districts are clamoring for Lori and Arlene to run the program. But the personnel and funds are just not there. Lori and Arlene have been very entrepreneurial. Receiving no new state monies for the program, they have secured federal and state grants and gifts from corporations, and they have established partnerships with schools and community agencies. But it appears that the institution is not willing to invest in outreach at the same level that it does in strategically managing enrollments to ensure a higher yield, academically and economically. The university has hired a private consulting firm in the latter realm and has

paid it over \$300,000 thus far. It has also appointed a new Vice President of Enrollment Management, with new staff and a big budget.

This pattern suggests to me the need for a case study of internal resource allocation, which I am in the process of organizing with José Luis Santos, and Sandy Guillen. Part of understanding the strategic direction of colleges and universities lies in analyzing internal resource allocations, not only among academic units, but also among nonacademic, support units. That is an aspect of academic capitalism and the new economy—understanding the balance of investment among different types of managerial professionals that privileges moneyed over underserved students.

CONCLUSION

Fifty years after the *Brown* decision our country still confronts inequitable patterns of educational provision and access. Moreover, the country is experiencing a demographic surge of minority populations and a rapid growth of immigrants, which has led many analysts and policymakers to talk of “Tidal Wave II.” They view the rising tide of demand for higher education, not as an opportunity to invest in growing the middle class, but rather as an impending crisis that threatens to overflow public institutions and bankrupt government. Backlash public policies have emerged against immigrants and against measures designed to increase the access of under-represented populations. In the video, I capture this resistance to opening the pod bay doors of higher education with a scene from the Marx Brothers film, *Horsefeathers*, in which Groucho, dressed in academic regalia sings: “Your proposition may be good, / But let’s have one thing understood: / Whatever it is, I’m against it; / And even when you’ve changed it or condensed it, / I’m against it.”

A subsequent scene and song in the video capture my sense of where most colleges and universities are heading. A scene from a Western shows a stampeding herd, which for me represents how most colleges and universities are following similar paths, chasing prestige (expressed in the video with photographs of *US News & World Report* covers about the best graduate schools and “America’s best colleges”) and revenue (hinted at with the background lines from “Stairway to Heaven”: “. . . and she’s buying a stairway to heaven”). I see institutions charging along a path that serves neither them nor the general population well. It is a path that leaves many students behind, trampled underfoot, a path that leads many institutions toward a precipice.

I believe that we should rebalance our colleges and universities, choosing a path that focuses more of our energies and resources on underserved and exploited populations, fulfilling significant functions of democratic service and social critique and progressive change. Thus, the final scene in the video

is the concluding scene from *The Grapes of Wrath* film, with the Tom Joad character saying, “Wherever there’s a fight so hungry people can eat, I’ll be there. Wherever there’s a cop beating up a guy, I’ll be there.” Although Tom is one individual, his choice is to be part of a collective effort, a labor movement challenging the power structures his people are confronting, seeking to change a system that exploits large numbers of farm workers in the interests of a few rich farmers.

And that leads to my conclusion, which offers one more concept—social entrepreneurialism. I was reading an article by James Austin (2004) in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* about the booming “third sector” of charitable, not-for-profit enterprises, a sector of the economy that is growing faster than either the private or public sector. It accounts for a larger share of the gross domestic product in the United States (6.7%) than the computer industry, or the auto and steel industries combined. And it accounts for 11.6% of the workforce. In this context, some top business schools are establishing social enterprise initiatives, courses of study on finding entrepreneurial solutions to social problems. Therein lies the energy and vitality of this not-for-profit sector; organizations can be enterprising in the pursuit of social justice. And there, I would argue, lies a feasible path for colleges and universities.

We often characterize social systems in biological terms. From the perspective of academic capitalism, we use the century-old biological metaphor of social Darwinian competition among colleges and universities: dominance of the fittest, the most efficient, the most entrepreneurial organizations. Yet most institutions are stampeding toward the same feeding grounds of a narrow range of new economy investments which cannot sustain most of them. They are building stairways to a hoped-for heaven of gains in revenues and prestige, often at significant opportunity costs and substantial economic losses. In contrast, I’d like to suggest a more forward-looking, ecologically balanced metaphor of niches, reflecting strategic synergies in the internal and external environments of colleges and universities. I suggest a more sustainable and feasible social entrepreneurialism, devoted more to sustaining social interventions.

That is why I suggest that, as institutions, collectivities, and individuals, we should make choices more like those modeled by Rudy Pasternak, who is a composite of Rudy McCormick and Katherine Pasternak. Rudy was a very able student in our master’s program. Though active in national professional associations, he works locally, giving back to his southside community, a place of much in- and out-migration across the Mexican border. For several years, Rudy has run a bridge program aimed at enhancing the access of students like him—smart, hard-working, low-income, first-generation Latino students. He was not a National Merit scholar of the sort public universities are targeting for more financial aid. Nor is he a doctoral

student—the coin of the realm in graduate program rankings (at least not yet!). He is doing work he values and working with the students and communities he's invested in.

Similarly, Katherine Pasternak, who is in the MBA program at the University of Arizona, is not the sort of student that most programs emphasize. She, too, is very able, but her interests lie in the nongovernmental, not-for-profit sector and in the economic development of borderland communities. She wants to work at supplying microloans to women in order to build local capacity. She will not attract large corporations looking to recruit her. She is not going to get a high-paying job. And in both of these characteristics, Katherine Pasternak will fail to enhance the revenues and rankings of her unit and institution.

Rudy and Katherine have chosen categories and sectors of employment—the managerial professional and not-for-profit sectors—which are fast growing but overlooked and undervalued. Moreover, they are part of groups and are connected to movements that challenge higher education institutions to do a better job of living up to their social responsibilities. They do not see revenue enhancement efforts of organizations as synonymous with working to enhance the public good. If, for some, academic capitalism seems the only reasonable path currently, for others, that path is an unattainable and unsustainable one for most institutions, a path that takes not-for-profit institutions too far away from creative social service, significant social critique, and enhanced social opportunity. Rudy and Katherine's choices represent a different sort of balance—a service-grounded commitment to underserved communities in the borderlands of a global economy.

The question is not whether to be entrepreneurial. Rudy and Katherine, like Lori and Arlene, are entrepreneurial, creatively generating diverse sources of support for their activities. The question is what balance of objectives should we turn our entrepreneurial energies to? Too often, academic capitalism in the new economy means the organization-centered pursuit of an imagined economic independence that is, in actuality, publicly subsidized, a pursuit unmitigated by a more socially centered understanding of our responsibilities to and interdependence with the world around us. To the extent that colleges and universities seek primarily to maximize their revenues and standing, as individual organizations, they will minimize the promise and potential of higher education as an institution.

To move more toward social entrepreneurialism would involve a conceptual shift in discourse about and in the research we conduct on higher education. Yet it could be achieved with marginal shifts in the balance of our activities and investments of institutional revenues. Pursuing a new balance in the academy is, in my view, the path to a future that will define a wider range of educational possibilities and more fully realize the promise of *Brown v. Board of Education* in our higher education system, in our society,

and in the models of policy and practice that we as a nation define globally. That is a higher education I would like to choose.

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W., & Oseguera, L. (2004). The declining "equity" of American higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(3), 299–320.
- Austin, A. E., & Wulff, D. H. (2004). *Paths to the professoriate: Strategies for enriching the preparation of future faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Austin, J. (2004, May 21). A first few principles for a booming third sector. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, p. 22.
- Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, 39(3), 363–91.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Chronister, J. L. (2001). *Teaching without tenure: Policies and practices for a new era*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Croissant, J., Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2003). *Virtual values and academic work*. NSF Grant 806345617.
- Dilley, P. (2002). 20th century postsecondary practices and policies to control gay students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25,(4), 409–432.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Geiger, R. (2004). *Knowledge and money: Research universities and the paradox of the marketplace*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gibbons, M., Limoges, C., Nowotny, H., Schwartzman, S., Scott, P., & Trow, M. (1994). *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hart, J. L. (2005). *Activism among feminist academics: Professionalized activism and activist professionals*. Advancing Women in Leadership. Retrieved in August 2005 from http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social_justice1/Hart.html.
- Herman, D. H., & Schmid, J. M. (Eds.). (2003). *Cogs in the classroom factory: The changing identity of academic labor*. Westport, CT: Greenwood/Praeger.
- Hurtado, S., Inkelas, K. K., Briggs, C., & Rhee, B. S. (1997). Differences in college access and choice among racial/ethnic groups: Identifying continuing barriers. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(1), 43–76.
- Lavin, D. (1996). *Changing the odds: Open admissions and the life changes of the disadvantaged*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lee, J., Cheslock, J., Maldonado-Maldonado, A., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Professors as knowledge workers in the new, global economy. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 20, pp. 55–132). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- McPherson, M. S., & Shapiro, M. O. (1998). *The student aid game: Meeting need and rewarding talent in American higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Metcalfe, A. (2004). *Intermediating associations and the university-industry relationship*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona.
- Milem, J., Berger, J. B., & Dey, E. L. (2000). Faculty time allocation: A study of change over twenty years. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 454–75.
- Perna, L. W. (2002). Sex differences in the supplemental earnings of college and university faculty. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(1), 31–58.
- Rendón, L., Novack, V., & Dowell, D. (2005). Testing race-neutral admissions models: Lessons from California State University–Long Beach. *Review of Higher Education*, 28(2), 221–244.
- Rhoades, G. (1998a). Reviewing and rethinking administrative costs. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 13, pp. 111–147). New York: Agathon Press.
- Rhoades, G. (1998b). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rhoades, G. (2004, September). *Technology-enhanced instruction and a Mode III organization of academic work*. Paper presented at the meeting of the European Association of Institutional Research meeting, Barcelona.
- Rhoades, G., & Maitland, C. (2005). Bargaining contingent labor. *NEA 2005 Higher Education Almanac*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Rhoades, G., & Moll, L. (2004, October). *The College Academy Program: Program evaluation*. Evaluation report for the Office of Early Academic Outreach, the University of Arizona.
- Rhoades, G., & Rhoads, R. (2003). The public discourse of U.S. graduate employee unions: Social movement identities, ideologies, and strategies. *Review of Higher Education*, 26(2), 163–186.
- Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). New models of management and shifting modes and costs of production: Europe and the United States. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(1), 3–28.
- Rhoads, R., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Graduate employee unionization as symbol of and challenge to the corporatization of U.S. research universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(3), 243–275.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W. G. (1997). *Academic outlaws: Queer theory and cultural studies in the academy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tierney, W. G., & Jun, A. (2001). A university helps prepare low-income youths for college: Tracking school success. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(2), 205–225.
- Toutkoushian, R. K. (1998). Racial and marital status differences in faculty pay. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69(5), 513–541.