

trary exercise of government power continues to represent the most significant threat to the academic community. Because the great majority of universities around the world are public institutions or are dependent on government funding, and because such institutions typically are viewed by governments as “prime instruments of national purpose,”⁴ governments have considerable power to influence what takes place on campus and an incentive to wield that power. Although one might have hoped that abuses would end with the cold war, experience has proven otherwise.

While many scientific associations have long had active human rights programs, little work is being done by academics in the humanities and social sciences. This may be slowly changing—new groups like the academic freedom committee of the Middle East Studies Association (based in the United States) have emerged in recent years—but there is still a pressing need for new commitments of time and resources.⁵ In particular, academics can and should make a contribution to public awareness and understanding of the values served by free expression. To date, international attention to this basic right has understandably emphasized artistic freedom and freedom of the press, essential attributes of a free society. Relatively little attention, however, has been paid to the crucial role played by academic institutions, dedicated to inquiry, information, and ideas, in preserving and giving meaning to the right.

By visiting or attempting to visit students and scholars in prison, raising money for their legal defense and medical needs, raising their cases with governments and international organizations, academics ensure that their colleagues are not forgotten. By joining with colleagues to speak out against politically motivated dismissals and other attacks on the autonomy of academic institutions, academics fulfill an important part of their mission as educators. ■

Notes

1. George P. Hagan, “Academic Freedom and National Responsibility in an African State: Ghana,” in *Academic Freedom in Africa*, ed. Mahmood Mamdani and Mamadou Diouf, (Dakar, Senegal: Codesria; Oxford 1994), 57.
2. Both the “Lima Declaration on Academic Freedom and Autonomy of Institutions of Higher Education,” adopted by the World University Service in 1988 as an international guidepost for the defense of academic freedom, and UNESCO’s “Recommendation Concerning the Status of Higher Education Teaching Personnel,” adopted in 1997, expressly recognize the intimate connection between academic freedom and protection of basic civil and political rights.
3. Article 19, International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.
4. Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).
5. Much of this work is now available on-line. The academic freedom page on the Human Rights Watch website (www.hrw.org), periodically updated, includes a list of relevant links.

Market Models, Managerial Institutions, and Managed Professionals

Gary Rhoades

Gary Rhoades is professor and director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Arizona, Tucson AZ 85721, USA.

The trend throughout much of the world is movement toward a U.S., “market-based” model of higher education. A related development is an increased role for management within individual institutions. What is overlooked in the promotion of such public policy shifts is the implications for social relations and social stratification in the academy and in society. Market models and managerial institutions bring with them a restructuring and renegotiation of social relations such that faculty are increasingly managed, stratified professionals. Moreover, this privatized, corporate model of American higher education has similar implications for social relations and social stratification in society at large.

The market model of U.S. higher education privileges certain markets over others. Over the past two decades it has reflected Reaganomics. It is “supply-side” higher education, focused more on employer than on student markets, and more on the needs of large private, transnational employers than on the needs of medium and small private and public employers. Supply-side policies are more suited to global than to local, national, and regional economies.¹

Such a model is ill-suited to enabling higher education to play a role in addressing current economic challenges. Two patterns define present economic developments: (1) increased polarization within (and among) societies, between haves and have-nots; and (2) the emergence of regional trading blocs. The supply-side market model of higher education has little to offer in the way of either mitigating socioeconomic polarization within countries or facilitating the balance of cooperation and competition among countries. Indeed, such neoliberal policies in U.S. higher education have exacerbated polarization in the academy, which is related to polarization in the broader economy. Monies are being disproportionately allocated to high-tech fields more than to fields with large numbers of students going into middle-class service and helping profession careers. The decline of various service-related fields in higher education such as social work, library science, nursing, and education corresponds to the decline of the middle class. Moreover, supply-side higher education undermines the support for various academic fields (e.g., foreign languages, humanities, social sciences, education) that are arguably central to effective cooperation among countries in regional trading blocs. In the United States, internationalization of the curriculum tends to mean the development of applied master’s degree programs in business and engi-

neering designed to enable the United States to exploit international markets, more than it means the development of educational experiences designed to promote cooperation among countries, even within regional trading blocs.

With a supply-side, market model of higher education comes change in the production process, in ways that make institutions increasingly managerial in their configuration.

With a supply-side, market model of higher education comes change in the production process, in ways that make institutions increasingly managerial in their configuration. Over the past two decades the greatest growth in professional personnel in U.S. higher education has been among support professionals, what I have called “managerial professionals.” Who are these people? The most traditional category on U.S. campuses is student services personnel, who provide all sorts of services to the burgeoning, changing student population. With increased emphasis on the use of new information and instructional technologies, various professionals and technical workers have emerged. Similarly, the increased emphasis on entrepreneurial activities has led to growing numbers of professionals in development (fund raising) and technology transfer. Increased accountability pressures, in turn, have led to growing numbers of assessment and institutional research professionals. What is happening is a decentering of faculty. Producing students, research, or outreach now involves a wide range of campus professionals.

There are two points here. First, in U.S. universities, professors are no longer the only profession on campus. The faculty’s share of professional positions on campus has declined—from about 64 percent in 1977 to about 55 percent in 1989, and falling. A second point is that managerial workforces are not cheap. There is not only a shifting of where costs in American higher education are being incurred—from faculty to support professionals and administrators—but also an increased cost per student that accompanies these changes. Some public research universities have seen an absolute decline in faculty numbers over the past five years, more than counterbalanced by an increase in numbers of administrators and support professionals, leading to increased institutional expenditures. Managerial personnel cost more than faculty.

The U.S., “privatized” model of higher education also brings with it a degree of stratification uncommon in most Western democracies, and a pattern of social relations on campus that is foreign to most countries. Stratification is so

steep that on the same campus there are entry-level faculty in one field who can make more than full professors in another field. And income dispersion is increasing. Moreover, social relations on campus are increasingly corporatized, as faculty find their time, work, and the products of their labor increasingly controlled by managers, who have extended their discretion at the expense of professional autonomy, and arguably of the public interest.² Neither pattern is an easy fit for most Western democracies.

How best is the public interest served? With the U.S. market model comes the assumption that managers, like fathers, know best. Or as the saying goes, “What’s good for business is good for America.” The corporate model of higher education places great discretion and faith in management. Other interests are simply given no place at the table, in contrast to the corporatist arrangements of many universities around the world. In the United States, the entrepreneurial prestige and “profit” interests of individual universities have become in some sense counterposed to the public interest (as is also evident in U.S. health care, with “managed care” companies).

Thus, for all its dynamism, entrepreneurial activity, and research productivity, the U.S. system has its own challenges. Those who would draw on the market model would do well to learn from our experience. In closing, I would note that at the turn of the last century the societal challenge was to mitigate the excesses of industrial, monopolistic capitalism. In the United States, “independent” professions emerged that in many ways played that role. The failure to meet that challenge in many countries contributed to tremendous social upheaval and world war. Now, at the turn of this century we again face the challenge of mitigating economic excesses, this time of global, hypercapitalism. The more higher education is modeled and reconstructed on a private, corporate market model, the less it can play such a mitigating role, and the more it itself contributes to the sharp polarization that promotes social upheaval. There are alternatives. American higher education has played other roles, and linked itself to other markets (e.g., student markets, and local economics). It has not only responded to, but pump-primed those markets, as did the post–World War II GI Bill, which expanded opportunity, promoted upward mobility and social progress, and solidified a middle class. It was an investment that higher education systems across the world could use today, that acknowledged the value of higher education, not simply economically, but socially. ■

Notes

1. Gary Rhoades and Sheila Slaughter, “Academic Capitalism, Managed Professionals, and Supply-Side Higher Education,” *Social Text* 15, no 2 (1997): 9–38.
2. Gary Rhoades, *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998).