

**Irreconcilable Differences:
The Corporatization of Canadian Universities**

by

Jamie Brownlee

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral
Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology (Specialization in Political Economy)

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

© 2014, Jamie Brownlee

Abstract

To date, there has yet to be a comprehensive national study of university corporatization in Canada. This study addresses this gap by reviewing the empirical basis, history, root causes and evolution of the transformation of higher education in Canada that has taken place over the past four decades. In this research, “corporatization” is used to refer to the process and resulting outcomes of the ascendance of business interests, values and models in the university system. Throughout the study, my two primary questions of interest are: (i) how has the corporatization of Canadian universities taken shape?; and (ii) what are the consequences of this restructuring both for higher education and society at large? The study begins with a brief historical review of the relationship between education and various sources of power, as well as some of the competing perspectives that have been used to explain university restructuring. I then review the main manifestations of the corporatization process, beginning with a detailed analysis of the casualization of academic labour. Drawing on a new and unique dataset collected through access to information requests, I provide a detailed account of the rise in the number of part-time and full-time contractually limited appointments in a number of Ontario institutions and discuss some of the impacts of this change. Subsequent chapters focus on the changing role of students (as consumers) in corporatized university spaces as well as changes in tuition and debt rates in Canada; how corporate management styles and practices have infiltrated university governance and programmatic and curriculum decisions; and the impact of corporate and commercial influences on academic research. Taken together, this evidence demonstrates that many of the defining characteristics of the public university are currently under threat, particularly its systems of governance,

academic freedom, and its approach to teaching and research. Moreover, I argue that there are irreconcilable differences between university and corporate institutions. The study concludes with a discussion of the fact that acts of resistance need to go beyond calling for new regulations within the current environment and seek more radical measures, given the fundamental incompatibility between these types of institutions.

Acknowledgements

There are many people who supported me throughout my PhD who I would like to acknowledge and thank. First, I would like to thank my committee. My supervisor, Wallace Clement, was a source of academic inspiration long before I entered the PhD program. I thank him for sharing his knowledge with me, for his guidance and kindness, and for encouraging me to pursue (and stick with) this ambitious project on higher education in Canada. Many thanks also to my other core committee members – Aaron Doyle and Neil Gerlach – for their insights and intellectual rigour, as well as my external examiners – Rebecca Schein and Norene Pupo – whose comments and questions have helped me be reflect on my work in new ways.

I would also like to acknowledge that this project and my academic studies were supported by a SSHRC research grant. As my research focused, in large part, on the challenges students face in higher education, I would be remiss to not draw attention to the importance of support, through SSHRC and other sources, in allowing students to focus on their academic pursuits. I would also like to thank those who made the extra effort to help me obtain data on academic labour in Ontario universities.

On a more personal note, I am grateful for this opportunity to formally thank the countless friends who provided intellectual support and companionship throughout my time at Carleton, including Kevin Walby, Chris Hurl, Dale Spencer, Robyn Green, Ben Christianson, Julie Tomiak, Seantel Anais and James Meades. My family was, and has always been, a tremendous source of encouragement, especially my parents Dale and Rod. Like many of the opportunities and privileges I have enjoyed in my life, my university education was made possible largely through their efforts. I would also like to

thank Rod Kueneman, for being a source of inspiration throughout my academic career, and the Almdal family for supporting me to have a meaningful break each holiday season. Thanks also to my uncle Doug for reading and commenting on various chapters of the manuscript, and for allowing me to better develop my arguments through our regular debates. Finally, I would like to offer my sincerest and most heartfelt thanks to my partner Salena Brickey. Throughout this process, she has been a source of unconditional love and compassion, and of moral and intellectual support. Salena read and edited every chapter of my dissertation, and her intellectual contributions were indispensable to improving the quality and clarity of the final manuscript.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	x
List of Appendices	xi
Chapter 1: The Corporatization of the University	1
CORPORATIZATION: DEFINING THE CONCEPT.....	3
WHY UNIVERSITIES?	8
<i>Public Universities: Changes in Enrolment and Employment</i>	9
<i>A Note on Social Relevance: Universities as Sites of Social Change</i>	11
CONSTRUCTING A NATIONAL PICTURE.....	14
A NOTE ON DATA AND METHOD	20
CHAPTER BREAKDOWN AND KEY AREAS OF INTEREST	22
Chapter 2: Historical Perspectives: Education and Power	26
FROM THE CHURCH AND THE STATE TO THE MARKET: A BRIEF HISTORY	28
THE “DUAL” ROLE OF EDUCATION IN DEMOCRATIC SOCIETIES	33
<i>Critical Perspectives: Education as a Mechanism of Social Control</i>	33
<i>Service Intellectuals</i>	38
<i>The Role of Higher Education in Challenging Power</i>	43
EARLY CRITICS OF THE CORPORATE UNIVERSITY	51
BETWEEN CAPITALISM AND DEMOCRACY: REFLECTIONS ON THE “GOLDEN AGE”	59
Chapter 3: Perspectives on Academic Capitalism and the Causes of University Restructuring	69
CORPORATIZATION AND ACADEMIC CAPITALISM.....	70
<i>Academic Capitalism in the Canadian Context</i>	75
FORCES OF RESTRUCTURING: INSIDE-OUT OR OUTSIDE-IN?	76
<i>Inside-Out: Academic Capitalism and the New Corporate Ethos</i>	77
<i>Outside-In: Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Corporate Offensive</i>	83
<i>Outside In: Specific Concerns of Retrenchment and Austerity</i>	91
GLOBAL TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION: INTERNATIONALIZATION OR CORPORATIZATION?.....	102

Chapter 4: University Teaching and the Casualization of Academic Labour	113
CHANGING PRIORITIES: THE TEACHING-RESEARCH NEXUS	113
DIGITAL DIPLOMA MILLS?	123
THE CASUALIZATION OF ACADEMIC LABOUR: CONTRACT FACULTY IN CANADA	130
<i>Defining Contract Faculty</i>	131
<i>Documenting the Rise in Contract Faculty</i>	134
<i>The Influence of Administrators and Wider Market Forces</i>	137
<i>The Conditions of Precarious Employment</i>	140
<i>Impacts on Students and Student Learning</i>	149
<i>The Role of Permanent Faculty</i>	153
<i>New Directions: Contracting Out?</i>	155
<i>Concluding Remarks: A “Perfected System”</i>	158
Chapter 5: Exposing the Transformation of Academic Labour through Access to Information Requests	162
ACCESS TO INFORMATION IN ONTARIO UNIVERSITIES: THE OCUFA TEST	165
COLLECTING CONTRACT FACULTY DATA UNDER FIPPA	167
<i>Data Selection: Social Sciences and Humanities</i>	168
<i>Data Collection</i>	169
<i>Assessing the Impact of the FIPPA and Past Information Claims</i>	170
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	177
<i>A Note on Headcount and Intensity Data</i>	177
<i>The Growth in Part-Time Sessional Appointments</i>	179
<i>An Emerging Three-Tiered Academic Hierarchy</i>	196
CONCLUSIONS: THE FUTURE OF UNIVERSITY HIRING	200
Chapter 6: The Rise of the Student-Consumer	204
LIBERAL EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL TRAINING AND THE RISE OF THE STUDENT-CONSUMER	204
<i>Educating the Student-Consumer</i>	210
<i>Surveying the Surveys: The Growing Importance of Money and Jobs</i>	212
<i>University Enrolments</i>	214
<i>Learning as a Service Encounter</i>	216
<i>Academic Dishonesty as Market Response</i>	218
<i>The Student-Consumer Paradox</i>	220
CUSTOMERS PAY: TUITION, DEBT AND THE HIGH COST OF LEARNING	221
<i>Tuition Trends in Canada: An Overview</i>	225
<i>The Importance of Provincial Variation</i>	229
<i>International Student Recruitment and Fees</i>	233
<i>Tuition Increases: The Views of Proponents and Critics</i>	236
<i>What Does the Public Think?</i>	239

<i>Student Debt and Student Aid: Recent Trends</i>	241
<i>The Social Consequences of Rising Tuition and Student Debt</i>	246
<i>Tuition, Debt and Access</i>	247
<i>Completion Time, Persistence and Employment</i>	250
<i>Post-Graduation: The Disciplinary Function of Debt</i>	252
Chapter 7: The Corporate Management Takeover of Higher Education ..	256
CHANGING OF THE GUARD: UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS IN THE ERA OF	
CORPORATIZATION	258
<i>The Impact of Fiscal Retrenchment</i>	258
<i>Expanding Ranks and Salaries</i>	260
<i>The New University CEOs</i>	263
<i>Boards of Governors and University-Corporate Board Interlocks</i>	268
CORPORATE GOVERNANCE MODELS	274
<i>The Discourse of Managerialism</i>	276
<i>Centralizing Power in the Academy</i>	277
<i>Performance Indicators</i>	279
<i>University Rankings</i>	282
<i>Marketing the Corporate University</i>	285
<i>The Suppression of Academic Freedom</i>	288
CURRICULUM REFORM, CAMPUS INFRASTRUCTURE AND CORPORATE CONTROL.....	293
<i>University Curriculums and the Fate of the Liberal Arts</i>	294
<i>Structured Inequalities: Capital Funding and Public-Private Partnerships</i>	300
<i>SuperBuild</i>	301
<i>The Canadian Foundation for Innovation</i>	302
<i>The Knowledge Infrastructure Program</i>	303
<i>Deferred Maintenance and “Hidden” Costs</i>	305
<i>Donor Agreements</i>	307
<i>The Munk School of Global Affairs</i>	310
<i>The Balsillie School of International Affairs</i>	311
<i>The Clayton H. Riddell School of Political Management</i>	312
Chapter 8: Innovation, Commercialization and the Corporate Corruption	
of Academic Research	314
A HISTORY OF RESEARCH POLICY IN CANADA.....	315
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND COMMERCIALIZATION IN CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES ...	332
<i>Creating the Commercial Infrastructure</i>	334
<i>Public Subsidy, Private Profit: Changes to IP Ownership Rights</i>	338
<i>Commercialization: Interpreting the Data</i>	340
THE CORPORATE CORRUPTION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH.....	346
<i>Selection of Research Topics</i>	347
<i>Research Secrecy</i>	350
<i>Conflicts of Interest and Research Bias</i>	356

<i>Big Pharma, Biotechnology and the Perversion of Academic Medicine</i>	359
<i>Ghost-Writing and Ghost-Management</i>	365
<i>Assessing the Impact</i>	368
CONCLUSIONS: SHIFTING RESEARCH AGENDAS	370
Chapter 9: Concluding Remarks	373
STUDYING THE CORPORATIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN CANADA.....	375
LIMITATIONS AND AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	378
REGULATING CORPORATIZATION: THE VIEWS OF CENTRIST CRITICS	381
IRRECONCILABLE DIFFERENCES	384
<i>Implications: The Need for Radical Reform</i>	388
INTERSECTORAL ALLIANCES	395
<i>Recent Developments in the Student Movement</i>	395
<i>The Role of Intellectuals in Opposing Corporatization</i>	398
RELEVANCE REVISITED	401
Appendices	404
Appendix A	404
Appendix B	406
Appendix C	407
Appendix D	408
References	409

List of Tables

Table 5.1	University Responses to ATI Requests	172
Table 5.2	York Part-Time Contract Faculty (LAPS)	181
Table 5.3	Carleton University.....	184
Table 5.4	Trent – Part Time Sessional Appointments	189
Table 6.1	Average Undergraduate Tuition	226
Table 6.2	Most Expensive Undergraduate University Programs in Canada	227
Table 6.3	Tuition and Compulsory Fees, 1990-91 to 2015-16 (Current \$)	232
Table 7.1	University Presidents’ Compensation, 2010	267
Table 7.2	CFI Funding by Discipline, 1998 to 2009	304
Table 8.1	Year of Incorporation of Spin-Off Companies	341
Table 8.2	Intellectual Property in Canada’s Higher Education Sector	342
Table 8.3	IP Expenditures and Revenues	345

List of Appendices

Appendix A Characterizations of Modern Universities.....	404
Appendix B Faculties.....	406
Appendix C Fee Estimates, Fee Waivers and Costs	407
Appendix D Information Timeframe	408

Chapter One: The Corporatization of the University

Increasingly, corporate interests and corporate culture are gaining hold in higher education. Around the world, we are seeing the corporatization of universities, where the fundamental role and functions of universities are changing. At the same time, we are seeing these changes being contested through student and other acts of resistance. In order to set the stage for the discussion that follows, it is useful to reflect on the nature of these acts of resistance: what is being contested, why, and where? In Canada, the most recent example was the 2012 Quebec student strikes, which began with a series of actions opposing the provincial government's planned tuition increases. On May 22 2012, the 100th day of the strike, demonstrations took place across the province with students staging a massive rally in Montreal that has been described as "the single biggest act of civil disobedience in Canadian history" (Annis 2012; Camfield 2012; Mennie et al. 2012). These same students faced court injunctions, police repression, thousands of arrests and a new law aimed at criminalizing dissent. During this and other resistance activities in the province, students received widespread support from parents, teachers, unions, public service workers and university professors. This support was, in large part, a result of the fact that this student movement had ostensibly become part of a larger social and political struggle against educational commodification and a new social and economic vision of Canadian society.

Similar movements have surfaced in other parts of the world. In 2009, for example, the most dramatic US student mobilizations since the 1970s took place, with thousands of California university students organizing demonstrations that culminated in a mass walk-out and a series of occupations across the entire University of California system. These

protests were in response to a decision to significantly increase tuition fees, which followed a series of actions that had already compromised a post-secondary system once known as one of the finest in the world. Also in 2009, universities in France were disrupted by strikes and occupations in opposition to President Nicolas Sarkozy's proposed neoliberal "reforms," while student groups in Austria occupied university classrooms for an entire semester to contest university financing proposals. Perhaps the most visible confrontations over university restructuring in Europe took place in 2010 in the United Kingdom, where citizens and activists challenged austerity measures, such as funding cuts to higher education and proposed tuition increases of nearly 300 percent. In 2011, hundreds of thousands of students in Chile started a mass demonstration against tuition hikes. The initial demonstration progressed into a broad-based movement for the abolition of tuition fees, the wholesale democratization of educational institutions, and radical changes to the structure of the capitalist economy (Larrabure and Torchia 2011). The scale of the Chilean protests attracted widespread international attention and contributed to the rise of related activism in other countries, including students in Latin America using World Education Day to fight for free, universal education (Figueroa-Clark 2011). This selection of events is only a sample of the wide range of education-based activism taking place around the world.

While the initial focus of many of these recent resistance movements – in Canada and elsewhere – was to prevent tuition hikes and government cutbacks to higher education, their attention has evolved to include broader educational and social challenges. Increasingly, critiques of educational restructuring are set within a wider critique of the capitalist system and the fate of the public sphere. Students and other

activists are locating educational concerns within the context of declining public programs and services, austerity agendas, attacks on worker rights, structural unemployment, environmental destruction and the expansion of corporate power. All of these movements are also grounded in broader demands to rethink the governance of the public university and the restructuring or “corporatization” of higher education. Before explaining how this study picks up on and contributes to this growing debate, I will first provide some background and historical information on the concept and practice of corporatization.

Corporatization: Defining the Concept

The current state of higher education and its ties to corporate interests has deep roots. The historical, evolving relationship between universities and the business world has been a contentious one for scholars across many generations. Writing in the early 1900s, Thorstein Veblen (1918) criticized the intrusion of business ideals and methods upon the true and professed values of the university. For Veblen, the introduction of business principles was evident throughout the institutional structure, including university governing boards, academic research practices and in the classroom. Harold Innis (1946), one of Canada’s most renowned economists, later warned that universities would be severely compromised if business gained a more explicit hold over their operations. In Innis’ words, “[t]he descent of the university into the market place reflects the lie in the soul of modern society” (p. 76). Some years later, E.P. Thompson (1970) criticized the process in England where public universities were developing a symbiotic relationship with the aims and ethos of industrial capitalism, while David Noble (1977) drew attention

to how corporations in the US were attempting to refashion higher education to meet their needs as employers and to gain control of scientific invention. Of course, not all have been critical of the growing relationship between corporations and universities. William Wickenden, for example, one of the earliest and most prominent advocates of corporate-university linkages in the US, explained the relationship in this way:

The very word university comes from the Latin word for corporation and the college dormitory is simply a continuation of the plan of the guilds by which the master workmen not only trained their apprentices but took them into their households to live. That is where our circle began, but as it swung out on its wide arc, the world of education drew further and further away from the world of industry ... The Sorbonne and Oxford scarcely knew of the world of science and for the world of industry they had only disdain. But the two circles went swinging on, bringing industry and education ever closer and closer, until tonight they are closing back once more at the point of origin where industry and education are one; where corporation and university again mean the same thing (cited in Noble 1977: 167).

These early connections between universities and business interests that caught the attention of scholars are still evident today, though they have assumed new and more intimate forms. In my study of how university restructuring has taken shape in Canada, I will use the term “corporatization” to refer to the process and resulting outcomes of the ascendance of business interests in the university system. This term is not a new one; “corporatization” and the “corporatized” university are commonplace in contemporary academic and lay circles. Given the common and varied use of the term, it is important to briefly define here what is meant by corporatization in this context.

On this point, Henry Steck (2003) stresses the importance of conceptual clarity. He argues that corporatization cannot be viewed as merely the entanglement of universities with business interests because there has never been a period in modern history when universities have been completely free from capital’s influence or untouched by corporate

practices. Universities have always functioned to serve the practical interests of businesses and their other stakeholders; however, this utilitarian approach of universities in and of itself does not constitute corporatization. Taking this as a starting point, it is useful to consider Steck's (2003: 74-75) definition of the corporatized university as "an institution that is characterized by processes, decisional criteria, expectations, organizational culture, and operating practices that are taken from, and have their origins in, the modern business corporation. It is characterized by the entry of the university into marketplace relationships and by the use of market strategies in university decision making." He adds that while corporatization reflects several long standing trends in educational reform, the fundamental difference is the nature and extent of the penetration of the university by the corporate economy. Steck is not arguing that universities have totally abandoned their traditional functions of teaching, research and service, but that the context in which this work takes place has undergone a significant shift. What is new about the current threat to higher education is the increasing pace of corporatization and the extent to which corporate values, policies and modes of governance are permeating public universities.

In defining corporatization, it is also important to distinguish between corporatization and privatization. At a basic level, privatization involves the act or process of transferring ownership from the public to the private sector. Corporatization, on the other hand, is more complex. Its various manifestations, which will be explored throughout this study, are associated with a number of key indicators and outcomes. One of these indicators is the enhanced institutional integration between universities and corporate institutions (e.g., the expansion of public-private "partnerships" and donor

agreements; the acceptance of corporate control over university curriculum and infrastructure development). Others involve “business-like” practices and objectives that are increasingly employed by universities themselves (e.g., an expanded profit motive; a redefinition of public space on campuses; new policies and incentives that direct research missions toward commercialization and private gain; the casualization of academic labour; new restrictions on academic freedom in both teaching and research; challenges to collegial self-governance and the adoption of corporate management models). The outcomes or consequences of corporatization are equally complex. They include the more general transformation of higher education from a public to a private good (e.g., a growing reliance on student tuition fees and a redefinition of students as educational consumers; a shift in the university’s mission away from the provision of liberal arts education; and growing inequality and stratification within and between universities). Corporatization in the university context involves providing businesses with the means to socialize the risks and costs of research while privatizing the benefits, and to accrue advantages through the transfer of technology to the private sector. It subsidizes the retraining of the corporate workforce through a vocational and technically-oriented curriculum, at the same time as increasing marketing opportunities for corporations and bolstering the perception of business legitimacy in higher education. It also provides the corporate sector with greater control over an institution that has, at times, directly challenged its power. Rather than being “sold off” to the private sector, the uses and benefits of university resources and knowledge production are being handed over to private interests at the public’s expense.

In general terms, then, corporatization is based in efforts to transform the university's mission and modify its operations to better serve the private marketplace. In the words of William Carroll (2004: 181), today's university campus has been identified as "a site of capital accumulation, a place for creating or enhancing the profit-making capacity of individuals, businesses, or the country itself." Under corporatization, the public mission of the university – which has traditionally emphasized democratic goals and service to the broader community – is being reduced in favour of private and commercial interests. New and expanded corporate-university linkages have encouraged a more direct integration of the university into the capitalist production process and transformed its critical public role. As a result, the integrity of the public university as an objective and disinterested source of knowledge is being challenged.

It is also important to understand how the *process* of corporatization unfolds. Corporatization involves a combination of institutional changes that, taken together, form a comprehensive, tangible process. These shifts are not isolated or distinct from one another; they are closely related and mutually reinforcing. They also should not be seen as simply a series of discrete changes. As Claire Polster (2004: 95) explains, the corporatization process is not "additive," it is transformative. That is, corporate-university linkages "are not an 'add-on' to the university, such that after their establishment we have the old university plus these links." On the contrary, these relationships are changing the nature and function of the university through qualitative changes in the university's culture, its system of governance, as well as its approach to teaching and research. Put another way, the public university is shifting from "an institution whose practices emerge from its distinctively academic and educational

character, to one whose practices emerge from its character as a business organization” (Newson 1994: 152).

The corporatization of universities in Canada represents an institutional transformation that has occurred gradually over the past four decades. The empirical basis of this transformative process – its history, root causes and evolution in Canada – forms the basis of this study. My two primary questions of interest are: (i) how has the corporatization of Canadian universities taken shape?; and (ii) what are the consequences of this restructuring both for higher education and society at large? In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss my rationale for focusing exclusively on public universities in Canada, highlight some of the challenges involved in constructing a national picture, and briefly outline my methodology and data sources.

Why Universities?

Canadian post-secondary education encompasses many types of instructional programs offered by universities, colleges and academic, technical, vocational and continuing professional education institutes. In Canada, there has been a large growth in the number and type of degrees (and associated credentials) offered by a wider variety of institutions over the past twenty-five years. One of the consequences, according to Dave Marshall (2008: 5), has been the proliferation of “new ‘degree’ experiences that are delivered by private for-profit, private not-for-profit, non-secular, virtual and non-university institutions.” The complexity of Canada’s post-secondary system is of course amplified by the fact that education in Canada is a provincial responsibility, with each province and territory managing its own system of institutions, structures and policies. In fact, the

Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) considers Canada to be the only member country without a national system of post-secondary education.

While the corporate restructuring of higher education has important implications for the entire post-secondary system, my research focuses exclusively on universities. This decision was made, in part, to manage the inherent complexity in the system and also because studying universities allows me to demonstrate a broad range of changes to higher education in Canada. More specifically, I concentrate on Canadian public universities, loosely defined as those who are members of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). These universities range from small, undergraduate liberal arts schools to large, multi-campus research-centred institutions. This study does not include private universities for two primary reasons. First, unlike the US, Canada's university system remains a largely public one. A small number of private non-profit and private for-profit schools operate across the country, but otherwise Canadian universities are public. Second, the recent history of private for-profit universities suggests that, although the private education sector continues to expand at the global level, the industry has experienced a decline in Canada with few of these institutions remaining operational.¹

Public Universities: Changes in Enrolment and Employment

In explaining my selection of public universities for this study, it is also important to briefly review recent trends in enrolment and employment. While university participation

¹ Nevertheless, it should be noted that the threat of private universities to public education in Canada should not be dismissed, especially in the context of international investment agreements like the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) where there is the potential for foreign companies to at some point be granted the same rights and government supports as public institutions. Furthermore, despite their difficulties in Canada, private institutions of higher education (many of them for-profit) represent the fastest growing sector worldwide (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2009).

in Canada is not as high as its rate of post-secondary attendance, enrolment rates are increasing across universities.² More specifically, the number of full-time undergraduate students has risen by 44 percent since 2000, while full-time graduate enrolment has grown by 82 percent (AUCC 2012). In 2011, total Canadian undergraduate university enrolment surpassed one million students, setting a new enrolment record. Nationally, university enrolment is projected to continue its upward climb.³

Related to this, universities are an important element of study, given the growing importance of university education in securing stable employment. In today's economy, higher education is no longer considered a luxury but is a requirement for many fields of work. Using data from Statistics Canada's Labour Force Survey, the AUCC (2010b) reports that from 1990 to 2009, the number of jobs occupied by people with a university degree more than doubled (from 1.9 to 4.2 million), whereas the number of jobs for individuals with a high school diploma or less declined by 1.1 million. This trend of increasing access to jobs for university graduates and declining employment

² Compared to other countries in the OECD, Canada ranks as one of the highest in terms of educational expenditures per student and educational attainment at the tertiary level. International comparisons also place Canada at the top in terms of post-secondary participation (Statistics Canada 2010a; Lavoie 2009). In fact, the OECD's *Economic Survey of Canada 2012* and its recent *Education at a Glance 2012* notes that Canada has the highest proportion of adults (25 to 64 years) that have completed post-secondary education among all OECD countries. In large measure, this position is explained by the country's high proportion of college students, which includes the unique Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel (CEGEP) program in Quebec. According to the AUCC (2011a), Canada has approximately three times more post-secondary non-university graduates than the OECD average. Statistics Canada (2009a) reports that the proportion of Canadians aged 25 to 64 with post-secondary qualifications increased from 43 percent in 1993 to 61 percent in 2008. Over 80 percent of Canadian families now expect their children to attend an institution of higher learning (Canadian Council on Learning 2010a).

³ While statistics generally support that there is an increase in enrolment, there is some dispute regarding how participation rates in Canadian post-secondary institutions are defined. Joseph Berger (2009a), for example, criticizes Statistics Canada and the AUCC for basing their enrolment projections on an increasing rate of participation. These authors claim that national university participation rates were actually lower throughout the 2000s than they were in the mid-1990s. Moreover, Finnie et al (2010) note that while current post-secondary enrolment *levels* are at all-time highs, participation rates for those aged 18 to 24 have been declining for a least a decade.

opportunities for those without such credentials has continued through the recent economic crisis. Moreover, given the projected growth in employment for occupations requiring post-secondary education, universities are now indispensable for labour markets and Canadians' economic future. Rick Miner (2010), for example, predicts that 77 percent of Canada's workforce will need to have post-secondary credentials by 2031 to stave off a labour crisis in the "knowledge economy," a significantly higher proportion than the current figure of 60 percent. Thus, understanding the changing role and function of universities is increasingly important in a socioeconomic context where more and more citizens are pursuing a university education and these particular credentials are increasingly linked to stable and meaningful employment.

Universities as Sites of Social Change

In addition to the sort of evidence-based rationale noted above, I have also selected universities in light of the role they play in other areas of Canadian society. Universities are widely understood to have an unquantifiable impact on our individual and collective identities, our communities, our culture, and our ability to perceive and resist other powerful institutions. In general, higher education is equated with the public service mission to prepare citizens for occupations centred on public service as well as to produce public knowledge. The university's role is understood to be so critical to informing public life and civic participation that it might even be considered "the paradigmatic institution of the public sphere" (Calhoun 2006: 10). Henry Giroux (2008: 148-149) explains why universities matter in this way:

While the university should equip people to enter the workplace, it should also educate them to contest workplace inequalities, imagine democratically organized forms of work, and identify and challenge those injustices that

contradict and undercut the most fundamental principles of freedom, justice, and respect for all people who constitute the global public sphere. Higher education is about more than job preparation and consciousness-raising; it is also about imagining different futures and politics as a form of intervention into public life. In contrast to the cynicism and political withdrawal fostered by media culture, education demands that citizens be able to negotiate the interface of private considerations and public issues, be able to recognize those undemocratic forces that deny social, economic, and political justice, and be willing to give some thought to the nature and meaning of their experiences in struggling for a better world.

The social and institutional roles of the university, most notably its public service mission, often place it in opposition to the values and objectives of the corporate sector. It is these functions of the university that are most threatened by external actors and institutions within the context of corporatization. And it is these sources of tension – between liberal education and corporate job training, critical research and commercial invention, public service and profit-making – that have been the subject of sustained debate and opposition. Public universities have come under attack not just because of the services they perform but, at a more fundamental level, because of the values they represent.

Acknowledging this role of universities is not meant to suggest that universities are (or ever have been) wholly public-oriented or subversive institutions. Universities have a complex set of functions and goals – many of which do not align with freedom of inquiry or public service – and they function more to support dominant social values than to challenge them. Nevertheless, universities are one of the only social institutions that encourage the development of new social visions and modes of thought. So, while many public universities have already moved a considerable distance towards a corporate model of organization, they are still counted on to challenge established structures of

power and to provide a reliable source of disinterested inquiry. Community colleges and other institutions of higher learning are experiencing many of the same kinds of pressures (e.g., financial stress, curriculum reform), but the consequences of the changes taking place are different because of the unique role that universities are supposed to play. In short, there is something distinctive about the university that cannot be found elsewhere in society, and for this reason many contend that the university should be a centre for radical social inquiry and activism. Today's critics look at whether universities are supporting this kind of thinking and activism to evaluate the extent to which they are fulfilling their public roles. As Giroux (2007a: 203) explains, the greatest challenges facing universities today are not technical, instrumental or economic in nature; rather, they centre on the willingness of higher education to confront the "myriad of global problems that produce needless human suffering, obscene forms of inequality, ongoing exploitation of marginalized groups, rapidly expanding masses of disposable human beings, increasing forms of social exclusion, and new forms of authoritarianism."

To summarize, I am focusing on universities both because these institutions are meant to be a place in which critical analysis can be freely conducted and because of the central importance of this public service role – and "subversive" function – within the larger society. Corporatization has, and continues to, directly threaten the university's public service mission, and it is vitally important to subject this process – and its effects – to a critical analysis.

Constructing a National Picture

To date, there has not been a broad national study of university corporatization in Canada. This is partly because the critical scholarship on corporatization only started to emerge relatively recently. Throughout the 1980s, for example, there was little academic discourse about the increase in corporate-university linkages under neoliberal restructuring. The work of Janice Newson and Howard Buchbinder was particularly significant in this time period because they were among a small group of critics who offered a dissenting voice. Their first major work, *The University Means Business* (1988), challenged the “almost unquestioned assumption that Canadian universities should overcome their recent misfortunes by building renewed links with the corporate sector” (p. 9). In their words, the “marriage between ivory tower and marketplace” – a process they likened to “an unfolding drama with few critics and perhaps no audience” – required an immediate and robust debate (p. 90). Central to their critique was that these changes should not be viewed as an aberration or as a short-term solution to underfunding, but as the “blueprint for carrying universities forward into the twenty-first century” (Buchbinder and Newson 1990: 377). For the most part, Canada’s academic community did not perceive the beginning of corporatization as a threat to the teaching, research or public service mission of universities. Few scholars took the threat seriously and most believed that the impact would be marginal at best. In fact, early critics like Newson and Buchbinder were accused of seeing “shadows in the bushes” and adopting an “anti-business” or “turgid Marxist” position (Newson 2010: 255, 1992: 228; Skolnik 1988: 81).

In the 1990s, researchers began to focus more critical attention on the potential negative ramifications of the “marriage between ivory tower and marketplace” (e.g.,

Carroll et al. 1992; Nelsen 1997a; Newson 1992, 1994 and 1998). Around the same time, the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) emerged as an organized, vocal critic of corporatization, and sponsored a series of books on the growing impact of restructuring on teaching and research agendas, the erosion of collegial governance and academic freedom, and the declining ability of universities to serve the public interest (e.g., Bruneau and Savage 2002; Tudiver 1999; Turk 2000, 2008a). Other scholars engaged more directly with the impact of restructuring on teaching and learning. Arguing that the quality of university education was in a state of decline, these authors raised important questions about a range of issues, including distance education and the commodification of instruction (Noble 2001); the emphasis on specialized research at the expense of undergraduate teaching (Pocklington and Tupper 2002); the transformation of students into educational “consumers” (Côté and Allahar 2007); the precarious employment of contract faculty (Rajagopal 2002); and how the pressures of the marketplace threatened the traditional values of liberal education (Axelrod 1998, 2002). Still others examined the unique experiences and challenges faced by women in a more corporatized academic setting (Reimer 2004); the changes in academic culture and its implications for university research (Chan and Fisher 2008a); and the ways in which academic freedom and university autonomy have been subordinated to corporate agendas (Woodhouse 2009). Claire Polster’s work on the declining public service mission of universities and the changing social relations of research (e.g., 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2007a) has also been instrumental in the Canadian context, as has the scholarship of leading educational theorist Henry Giroux on the corporatization of higher education in

Canada, the US and elsewhere (e.g., Giroux 2007a; Giroux and Giroux 2004; Giroux and Myrsiades 2001).

That the literature expanded in this way over a relatively short period reflects how quickly the academic terrain shifted from general ambivalence to widespread recognition and critical concern. Nonetheless, there has yet to be a pan-Canadian study of corporatization. The majority of work on university restructuring has analyzed changes and trends at the provincial level. This is not surprising because, as noted above, Canada's approach to higher education policy is the most decentralized of any advanced industrialized country; Canada has never had a federal higher education policy framework or a federal ministry of education. While the federal government provides core funding support to universities and is involved in a range of policy relevant research and student financial assistance, provinces have substantial autonomy and control over higher education. I would argue that it is precisely because Canada has a decentralized system of higher education that developing a national picture is important, and it follows that the aim of my study is to provide such an analysis. Nevertheless, constructing a broad picture is not without challenges.

For one, there is significant variation between provinces with respect to the timing, breadth and intensity of corporatization. As Glen Jones and Stacey Young (2004) note, following the large reductions in transfer payments associated with the federal budget cuts of the 1990s, the policy frameworks of provincial governments began to diverge. By the early 2000s, Canadian higher educational policy was "riding madly off in all directions" (p. 204). In each province, a unique intersection of federal and provincial market-based strategies has been layered onto more traditional public sector regulation

and funding structures. Moreover, the process of university restructuring by province is not linear because the process expands and contracts depending on the context, including the political party in power and the policies of the governments that preceded it. In many instances, it is important to attend to the unique political history in each Canadian province to accurately assess university restructuring in Canada. Throughout this study, I rely on this history as well as comparative empirical data in order to accurately assess provincial variation within the national context.

In the same way as a national assessment of corporatization is complicated by its different manifestations across provinces, variation also exists across universities and subject areas within and between provinces. For example, faculty members in larger, research-oriented institutions and in commercially relevant fields experience corporate and commercial pressures more acutely. On the other hand, academics who are further removed from the market and less dependent on corporate funding may have greater autonomy to shape their research practices, but they may be at a higher risk of being deemed “irrelevant” in the eyes of business, governments, university managers and even the public.⁴ For this reason, I will pay specific attention to the differential impact of corporatization across institutions and subject areas in order to present an overview of the transformative process across Canada.

Another complicating factor in conducting an expansive study of corporatization is that higher education researchers are often part of disparate knowledge communities and locate their work in different academic settings. These researchers tend to treat mutually-

⁴ In other words, university researchers whose knowledge is not directly linked with the market, like those in the social sciences and humanities, may “find themselves in a position analogous to that of manual workers in industry whose tacit knowledge has lost its former currency” (Kleinman and Vallas 2001: 474).

reinforcing processes discretely and in isolation, which limits the ability to understand the ways these complex issues interact and are tied to the broader, overriding process of transformation. For example, scholars who write about the commercialization of research often neglect how this trend is connected to rising tuition fees or reductions in collegial governance, while those who study the exploitation of contract faculty often do not explain how this practice is informed by intellectual property regimes. Polster (2007b: 319) explains why these elements should be viewed as an integrated process:

The centralization of power by academic administrators facilitates the establishment of university/industry research alliances and the commercialization of academic research. In turn, the commercialization encourages – indeed, compels – administrators to run universities more as businesses by curbing collegialism, transparency, and other long-standing academic traditions and values ... These changes also contribute to and, in turn, are reinforced by changes in the social relations of Canadian university teaching.

A key goal of my study, then, is to bring together topics that are usually considered separately – notably federal and provincial higher education policy, teaching and academic labour, university governance, curriculum reform, research commercialization and student life – with a view to illustrating the linkages between these elements.

Finally, this work is made more challenging by the fact that the number and size of universities varies in each province, which affects the amount and quality of available data. In some areas under study here, data and the corresponding analysis may be partial or limited to specific provinces/regions of the country. It should be noted that the focus, in some sections, is mainly on the Ontario context, largely because more has been written about the nature and history of Ontario universities than of those in any other province and because nearly half of Canada's full-time university students are located there. My

own data on contract faculty, detailed in Chapter 5, is also focused on universities in Ontario.

In spite of these challenges, I would argue that providing this kind of picture of public universities in the Canadian context is timely. The idea that public universities in Canada have reached a critical juncture in their history, or that they are in the midst of or approaching a “crisis,” has been a consistent theme in the higher education literature for decades.⁵ The nature of the crisis has varied according to the objectives and political persuasions of its claimants. Writing in the *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* over two decades ago, Glen Jones (1990) argued that one of the major shortcomings of “crisis literature” in higher education was its failure to provide convincing evidence that a crisis was imminent. According to Jones, it is “not enough simply to identify a problem or demonstrate an element of decline ... One must provide evidence that the problem is of such a magnitude that a failure to resolve the problem will lead to a decisive moment in which some characteristic of higher education will be threatened” (p. 3). Throughout my study, I will demonstrate the magnitude of the problem of corporatization and how it is and has threatened many of the defining characteristics of higher education. I will also clearly articulate the urgency of reversing the trend toward the “market makeover” of universities.

⁵ Higher education “crisis” literature is particularly prominent in the US. According to a recent survey sponsored by TIME and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, 89 percent of US adults and 96 percent of senior administrators at colleges and universities stated that higher education is in a state of “crisis” (Sanburn 2012).

A Note on Data and Method

To better understand and analyze the corporate restructuring of the university, I rely heavily on documentary analysis – one of the most commonly used methods for researching higher education (Tight 2003). In this method of research, both qualitative and quantitative data sources are used to explore a particular social problem or question. In my research, these sources include: academic and lay publications, surveys, government policy documents, reports, statistics and databases (both federal and provincial), and university statistics and/or documentary records. I have also consulted publications by organizations engaged in policy work on higher education, including university-affiliated groups (e.g., the CAUT and AUCC) and independent “third party” organizations (e.g., the Canadian Council on Learning and Educational Policy Institute). I also draw on socio-historical analysis and historiographies of higher education to contextualize many of the issues under review, as well as miniature case studies of issues or institutions that have strategic importance throughout. Finally, I used Access to Information requests to construct an original dataset on academic faculty in Ontario universities. A more detailed discussion of the methodology used in compiling this dataset is provided in Chapter 5.

With regard to the quality and availability of data on Canadian higher education, there are some unique challenges. Unlike other countries, Canadian universities are not subject to common, systematic reporting requirements and, therefore, there is a lack of data on the inputs and outcomes of the country’s higher education system. Moreover, much of the publicly available data produced by universities is not standardized, which

means it is of little comparative value.⁶ This lack of reliable national Canadian data also confounds comparative research on higher education taking place at the international level. For instance, according to the Canadian Council on Learning (2007), Canada recently ranked last among 40 OECD member nations and partner countries when it came to the amount of information on post-secondary education it supplied to the OECD; in fact, in a recent edition of the OECD's publication, *Education at a Glance*, Canada was unable to provide data for 60 percent of the requested indicators.

Adding to this challenge in gathering and accessing information is the recent elimination of several government funded research bodies, including the Canadian Policy Research Networks and the above-mentioned Canadian Council on Learning, which was an independent think-tank whose mandate included the construction of a pan-Canadian overview of the country's fragmented education system. While I do not necessarily agree with the policy analysis produced by these organizations, an important part of their mandate was to provide researchers and policy-makers with information to inform decisions about post-secondary education in Canada. Funding cuts to Statistics Canada that have led to the elimination or scaling back of key surveys and projects, as well as government policies reducing public access to its data, have further hampered research efforts in this area (Nilsen 2001). Most recently, Statistics Canada announced that it has discontinued the University and College Academic Staff System, or UCASS, which provided governments, policy analysts and universities with a detailed portrait of full-

⁶ The problems associated with post-secondary data are illustrated by the fact that the heavily criticized *Maclean's* magazine's annual *Guide to Universities* is often considered Canada's de facto common university dataset. Of note is that universities are currently considering data harmonization through an initiative called Common University Data Canada, which builds upon a similar project in Ontario (Common University Data Ontario).

time faculty in Canada. Cancelling this initiative has created yet another gap in Canada's national policy research infrastructure.

Based on the data and evidence that is available, I compliment my documentary research with conceptual analysis throughout. There is a long tradition of theoretical and philosophical approaches concerning the "idea" of the university, many of which explore the question of what the university *should* be. I critically engage with this literature – especially as they pertain to debates about the relationship between higher learning and corporate power – in order to frame my critique. Conceptual analysis of idealized university systems provides a sort of measuring rod within which to articulate a moral critique of corporatization. Like Ian Angus' (2009:10) work in this area, my goal in using this kind of analysis is to "balance a realistic assessment of the state of the contemporary university and the forces that would undermine it with a sense of what can be saved, reinvented, or discovered of its potential." Just as my study is informed by a conceptual look at different systems over time in Canada, I also draw on international examples to provide a comparative lens where appropriate.

Chapter Breakdown and Key Areas of Interest

Building on this cursory introduction to the corporatization of universities in Canada, Chapter 2 provides a historical overview of the university's relationship with external power, with a focus on economic power. Within this discussion, I explain some of the competing ideas and debates about the nature of this relationship and draw on specific historical periods and events to illustrate the "dual" role of universities. This dual role is centred around the changing relationship between universities and outside power

interests, where universities have been counted on to both support and challenge these interests. The chapter also includes a brief introduction to some of the earliest critics of the relationship between universities and corporations, or the “corporate university,” as well as a description of the changes associated with the so-called “golden age” of Canadian higher education in the 1960s and early 1970s.

In Chapter 3, I outline the dominant theoretical perspectives on the corporatization of universities, with a focus on “academic capitalism” and the internal and external causes of university restructuring. This discussion includes some of the political and economic factors that have facilitated the corporatization of higher education, including the impact of public funding reductions, and provides a global context on the transformation of higher education. Beginning in Chapter 4, my study builds on this historical and theoretical context to illustrate, in concrete ways, the impacts of corporatization in universities across Canada. More specifically, Chapter 4 explores how teaching and academic labour are being transformed in the corporatized university. What are the impacts of corporatization on the relationship between teaching and research? What is the casualization of academic labour and what are its key consequences – for universities, employees and students? In Chapter 5, I examine the use of contract faculty in Ontario universities. Drawing on unique data collected for the purposes of this study for 18 universities in Ontario, I provide a detailed account of the rise in the number of part-time and full-time contractually limited appointments in many Ontario institutions and discuss some of the impacts of this change.

In Chapter 6, I discuss the various ways in which the corporatization process is impacting students. The first part of the chapter provides a brief introduction to debates

concerning liberal education and vocational training in the university. Following this, I explain the transformation of students into educational “consumers.” How has the corporate university changed student culture and student identities? And what are the consequences of this shift? This chapter also includes an empirical assessment of the shifting political economy of student life, including the occurrence and impact of rising tuition fees and student debt, and the connections to higher education policies in the Canadian context. Chapter 7 shifts the focus from students to university administrations by exploring how traditional models of collegial self-governance have been undermined under corporatization. Here, I detail the changing characteristics of university administrators, the rise of corporate management models within the university, and the impact of these models on university curriculums, program development, infrastructure and the future of liberal education. The adoption of business values and practices within the university is both a cause and consequence of another indicator of the transformation of higher education: the commercialization of research. In Chapter 8, I investigate issues around how the corporatization of the university impacts the research culture and the research process. How have the priorities and parameters of university research changed? How has corporatization affected the selection of topics for investigation, the interpretation of findings and the dissemination of results? And what is the role of provincial and federal government actions and policies in influencing university-corporate research ties?

In the final, concluding chapter, I move from describing and analyzing the process of university restructuring under corporatization to focus on those individuals and groups who are resisting this transformation, both in Canada and around the world. Moving

forward, I argue that acts of resistance need to go beyond calling for new regulations within the current environment and seek more radical measures, given the fundamental incompatibility between university and corporate institutions. They also need to connect with broader social movements operating outside of the university that are challenging, at a broader level, the capitalist system, corporate power and the fate of the public sphere.

Chapter Two

Historical Perspectives: Education and Power

A large body of literature has analyzed the nature and history of universities. This range of study has looked at university roles and functions, values and commitments, and the many, competing challenges they have encountered since their inception. Interestingly, this literature points to the fact that, in spite of vast historical, social and economic changes, the normative and structural elements of universities have remained largely intact, including their (relative) freedom and independence, their concern for the advancement of knowledge and their role as centres of culture (Winchester 1986). In *The Uses of the University* (2001: 115), Clarke Kerr expressed the enduring nature of universities in this way: “About eighty-five institutions in the Western world established by 1520 still exist in recognizable forms, with similar functions and unbroken histories, including the Catholic church, the Parliaments of the Isle of Man, of Iceland, and of Great Britain, several Swiss cantons, and seventy universities.” Others have focused their attention on why this enduring nature or lack of change is particularly remarkable. Immanuel Wallerstein (1969), for example, noted that universities have persevered in a state of “perpetual tension,” where the institution is constantly reasserting itself, its own reality, as an “idea” at the same time as society seeks to constrain and harness it for its own purposes.

Universities have always been dependent on – and to a varying extent constrained and controlled by – external sources of power in society. Over time, the locus of this power has shifted from the church, to the state and the market. Somewhat contradictorily, universities have been set up as institutions whose role it is to challenge established

power relations. As Noam Chomsky (2003) explains, the social and intellectual role of the university is supposed to be a subversive one, regardless of the particular relations of ruling. That is, the university should be a disruptive and liberating institution that fosters the challenging of conventional thinking and systems of illegitimate authority. But Chomsky notes that the university's close association with external power inhibits and, at times, prevents it from fulfilling this role. This association is necessarily complex. Universities are economically (and otherwise) dependent on outside institutions for their survival, and those who provide this support often have a vested interest in ensuring that distributions of power and wealth remain unchanged. In Chomsky's words:

Naturally, the reigning institutions, state and private, use their power to try to shape the social and intellectual world in their own interests. Universities are economically parasitic, relying on external support. To maintain this support while serving their proper liberating function poses problems that verge on contradiction. In practice, universities face a constant struggle to maintain their integrity, their fundamental social role in a healthy society, in the face of external pressures. The problems are heightened with the expansion of private power in every domain (p. 198).

By necessity and/or by choice, universities have had to offer some loyalty or service to power in order to maintain a measure of autonomy.

There is, of course, debate about the extent and impacts of this association between universities and external power. While some have argued that one could "count on the fingers of one hand the eras in which the university has been anything better than the handmaiden of official society; the social club of ruling elites, the training school of whatever functionaries the status quo required" (Roszak 1967: 4), others present more nuanced pictures where, over time, universities have differentially been able to challenge systems of power and inequality. This debate is particularly important in the context of

the current study of corporatization in Canada. On the one hand, one could argue that universities have remained relatively robust institutions that have been able to withstand, albeit tenuously, the transformative powers of corporatization. On the other hand, it is important to understand that the unique set of pressures brought on by corporatization represent a new and significant challenge; in no other historical period have universities assumed such a close relationship with an institution so incompatible with their defining values and principles.

The purpose of this chapter is not to provide a comprehensive review of the university's history and purpose. Rather, I will focus on particular authors, historical periods and events to illustrate the changing nature of the university's relationship with external power – with a focus on economic power – and to highlight some of the competing ideas and debates surrounding this relationship.

From the Church and the State to the Market: A Brief History

Over time, different sources of power have influenced the structure and functions of universities. At the outset, universities were closely tied to the power of the church. The development of the first Western universities coincided with the administrative progression of the Roman Catholic Church through the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Universities had a role both in providing theological instruction and in entrenching the supremacy of church authorities through the legitimation of religious doctrine. Beginning in the Renaissance era, there was a shift where universities gradually expanded their services to include the nation-state and the education of a more secular and bureaucratic elite.

Throughout this long transition period, multiple sites of tension emerged. There was tension around whether the university's role was to advance theologically-based higher learning or support nation-building. At the same time, the inherent contradiction between service to power (be it the church or the state) and supporting critical inquiry emerged as an important source of concern. According to Paul Axelrod (2002: 17), early Renaissance scholars served as a catalyst to the "spread of an important dimension of liberal education that was partly comprehended later in the Enlightenment and was more fully embraced in the twentieth-century university: the need for scholarship to be free from unreasonable restraints and to be liberated to explore the full range of human beliefs and actions."

In the nineteenth century, the terrain shifted whereby religion had less control in the sphere of higher education and universities became more assimilated into the service of the market. Put another way, universities went from perpetuating systems of religious domination and control to helping to solidify new systems of social stratification (Katz 1986). Because technical and managerial knowledge was viewed as essential for state bureaucracies and corporations, universities were reorganized to produce the experts and the expert knowledge needed to support these agents of modern capitalism. Educational preparation for the privileged classes was extended to include managerial training for economic leadership.

Speaking briefly to the development of universities in Canada specifically, the training of clergy and the general education of social leaders underlay the establishment of the first English and French-speaking colleges and universities. These first Canadian universities existed, largely, to prepare a small proportion of the white male population

for religious, and later managerial and professional life.⁷ Economic and political elites were closely involved in the development and expansion of Canada's university system. King's College, the first university established in Upper Canada, was founded in the late eighteenth century by John Strachan. Strachan was a prominent member of the "Family Compact," which was an organization of merchants, landowners and government officials from Upper Canada's ruling class. Members of the Family Compact dominated the first governing council at King's College (Barkans and Pupo 1978).

Throughout the nineteenth century, financial and industrial elites increased their influence over universities in Canada through monetary contributions and by assuming positions of institutional leadership. For example, land and infrastructure for McMaster University was provided by Senator William McMaster, President of the Bank of Commerce. McGill University received "magnificent benefactions" from wealthy elites, the highest in the country and placing it, alongside the University of Toronto, at the forefront of scientific research (Cameron 1991: 26). In their formative years, Canadian universities also received support from foreign sponsors, both individual and institutional. Dalhousie University, for instance, was sponsored by George Munro, a New York

⁷ Prior to 1850, Canadian universities (e.g., Acadia, McGill, Queen's and Victoria) were largely imitations or "transplants" from other countries, including England, Scotland, Germany and the United States. From approximately 1860 onwards, they developed characteristics that differentiated them from foreign institutions, such as a distinctively Canadian curriculum (Harris 1976). For a concise summary of how the development of Canadian universities was shaped by the practices and philosophies of higher education in other nations, see Pocklington and Tupper (2002). The authors note, for example, that Canadian institutions were influenced by English ideals about higher education as a transmitter of culture; the Scottish emphasis on accessible undergraduate education; the German tradition of advanced research; and the public service mission of US land grant universities. Pocklington and Tupper (2002) contend that a unique Canadian "idea" about the role and purpose of the university never really emerged, but Glen Jones (1998) argues otherwise. According to Jones, the Canadian "idea" of a university is exemplified by a public, secular, autonomous, degree-granting institution, combined with more universal notions about the dissemination and advancement of disinterested knowledge. While many of these features are common to universities around the world, Jones argues that there are facets or "first principles" associated with the Canadian conception of the university that cannot be found elsewhere.

publisher and brother-in-law of Dalhousie president John Forrest, and many large American foundations provided money and expertise to new institutions. By the early 1900s, almost every Canadian university had received a grant from the Carnegie Foundation (Harris 1976), and it was well understood that this kind of support was not provided with purely philanthropic goals.⁸ At the same time, business leaders began to channel large sums of money to programs, professors and graduate students whose work they influenced and/or approved of, and occasionally even paid for professors' salaries (Enros 1983). For example, "tobacco king" William Macdonald financed agricultural programs at McGill; prominent distiller Colonel A.E. Gooderham provided research support for the study of fermentation at the University of Toronto; and leading Canadian bankers organized to influence business curriculums (Barkans and Pupo 1978: 83).

In addition to exercising power through various paths of direct financial support, elites also gained influence in Canadian universities through legislative mechanisms, encouraging programmatic changes and public awareness efforts. In 1906, Canada's economic elite formally increased its control over the country's university system with the passage of the *University Act*. The Act placed control and management of the University of Toronto in the hands of an appointed body, the Board of Governors, which

⁸ Foundation support for higher education is not merely philanthropy. In 1954, a US congressional commission investigated the goals and influence of large corporate foundations in the area of higher education (particularly their impact on the social sciences). Its conclusions are worth quoting at length: "The power of the individual large foundation is enormous. Its various forms of patronage carry with them elements of thought control. It exerts immense influence on educator, educational processes, and educational institutions. It is capable of invisible coercion. It can materially predetermine the development of social and political concepts, academic opinion, thought leadership, public opinion ... There is such a concentration of foundation power in the United States, operating in education and the social sciences, with a gigantic aggregate of capital and income. This Interlock has some of the characteristics of an intellectual cartel ... It has come to exercise very extensive practical control over social science and education ... [Social science research] is now almost wholly in the control of professional employees of the large foundations" (cited in Gatto 2003: 254-255).

consisted largely of wealthy business leaders. This move laid the grounds for a new basic university governance model and strengthened business influence over higher education. Around the same time, elites in Canada were working to ensure that the timing and nature of university expansion aligned with corporate interests. Professional and vocational programs were expanded and tailored to reflect the growth of major resource industries; Queen's University, for example, established a school of mining in 1893 and an engineering faculty in 1905. As well, the University of Toronto opened a school of forestry in 1907 (Axelrod 1982a). Campaigns by business groups were also important in restructuring higher education to meet corporate demands for technical and commercial training and industrial research facilities. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association (CMA), for instance, lobbied for new programs in commerce, finance and business administration, which led to a rapid expansion in the number of programs and student enrolment in these subject areas (Harris 1976). The CMA also exerted an "extended propaganda campaign" to ensure the establishment of university-based industrial research facilities and to usher in the creation, in 1916, of the National Research Council of Canada (Enros 1991: 211).

In sum, universities have always had a close relationship with external power and Canadian universities are no exception. From the beginning, the structure and purpose of Canadian higher education was modified – at least in part – at the behest of powerful elite sectors.

The “Dual” Role of Education in Democratic Societies

In the literature, two, largely competing views of education are presented: those that focus on its role in supporting existing power relations and those that highlight its role in contesting these relations. On the one hand, critical scholars focus on how universities and the intellectuals who operate within them are involved in processes of social control and legitimation. These writers clearly connect universities and capitalist relations of power and emphasize how elites influence and control the nature and function of education. On the other hand, some writers focus on the role that universities play in developing critical capacities and ways in which to understand, and potentially challenge, the way that power operates. The purpose of this section is to review these differing perspectives on the role of education.

Critical Perspectives: Education as a Mechanism of Social Control

Despite the connections between the educational sphere and these various sources of external power, a common misperception is that systems of schooling, from elementary through to the university level, are devoid of political and ideological purposes. While most would agree that schools are relatively free institutions that provide opportunities for independent thought, more critical perspectives emphasize that this autonomy is exercised within an economic, social and political context that affects both the structure and function of education. Critical education theorists view this relationship between educational institutions and power in a particular way: they argue that educational institutions function as mechanisms of indoctrination and social control, much like the corporate news media, the advertising and public relations industries and the entertainment industry. Bertrand Russell (1932), for instance, argued that education

functioned to maintain class divisions by producing what he called “irrational humility” among the poor. According to Russell, efforts to induce marginalized groups to accept their social position necessitated the teaching of falsehoods throughout the entire educational system.⁹ So, while mainstream theorists and historians assert that public education promotes social equality, critical education theorists see schools and universities as legitimating social class differences and contributing to the subordination of marginalized groups. For critical scholars, universities operate in the shadow and service of power, and function to preserve class privilege and protect and legitimate the social order. This discussion begins with how elites view education and the role it plays in reproducing class inequalities, and concludes by explaining the role of intellectuals in supporting this objective.

Critical education theorists, like Russell, are united by a critique of the meritocratic or liberal-democratic understanding of schooling in capitalist society; however, they focus their analyses in different ways. Some critical theorists focus on the mediating role of culture in reproducing class relationships, and emphasize the importance of the formal and informal culture of schooling, the construction and transmission of curricular knowledge, as well as how class domination in education is exercised through a process of hegemony (e.g., Bernstein 1977; Bourdieu 1977; McLaren 1986). Others are more interested in the close relationship between education and the capitalist political economy, with an emphasis on the class composition of the occupational structure, the

⁹ According to Russell (1932: 149-150), educational indoctrination in the interests of class domination involved: “ethical falsehood, since it is a representation that the inequality of the rich and the poor is not an injustice; economic falsehood, since it is suggested that the present economic system is the best possible; historical falsehood, since the previous conflicts of rich and poor are narrated from the standpoint of the rich.”

critical role of economic power in the process of educational change, and the reproduction of capitalist social relations through the “hidden curriculum” (e.g., Bowles and Gintis 1976; Carnoy and Levin 1976; Spring 1972; Katz 1971). For scholars within this stream, the hidden curriculum is understood as those social relations that legitimate specific values, attitudes and ideologies, especially with respect to practices of authority in the workplace. This curriculum operates in elementary and secondary schooling, and through higher education, with universities playing a key role in perpetuating systems of inequality as part of their larger function to act as an agent of social control.

Critical scholarship in the area of education, including the rise of mass education, is important because it illustrates how elites have historically tended to view the role of education in society. Elizabeth Vallance (1983) explains that a great deal of what is now understood as the hidden curriculum was open and explicit in the nineteenth century and formed a key part of the initial justification for schooling. These functions only “went underground” after those in power were assured that education was working; that is, it was providing sufficient levels of discipline and control. In the United States, for example, elites supported mass education because they feared that a growing, unschooled proletariat could disrupt the social order. To borrow from Ralph Waldo Emerson (1844), elites saw universal schooling as a way “to keep them from our throats” by discouraging free and independent thought. In Canada too, elite reformers shared “a common fear of the undisciplined and uneducated mind” (Houston 1975: 41). For them, a primary purpose of schooling was to control the emerging working class. They justified their support for schools by citing the moral and physical dangers of the unschooled masses to society. In both countries, elites recognized the importance of education as a form of

social rule that was accepted and internalized by the population. In the words of Egerton Ryerson (1847: 20), one of Canada's most recognized educators and public education advocates, "when a people know their rights, there is but one way to govern them, to educate them." Because of this emphasis on discipline and subordination in education, there was actually powerful resistance to the rise of mass public schooling across North America in the 1800s.¹⁰

In addition to explaining how elites have historically viewed education as an important means of social control, critical theorists have also undertaken analyses on how universities have come to reproduce social inequalities. In his work, Pierre Bourdieu (1988) argues that educational institutions, including institutions of higher learning, legitimate structural inequalities by mystifying the capitalist production process, socializing students to accept existing distributions of power and wealth, and preparing them for work in occupational hierarchies. Likewise, Canadian scholar Norene Pupo (1978) contends that higher education both reflects and reinforces the logic of capital accumulation. According to Pupo, student identification with capitalist ideology is produced through the emphasis in education on "industrial techniques, business practices and ideas of hierarchy, obedience, subordination, and competition" (pp. 146-147). Moreover, she argues that business leaders often support public higher education because they view universities as "major socialization agencies and ideology producing mechanisms, promoting a strong identification with those values, attitudes, and beliefs necessary for maintenance of the capitalist system." Michel Foucault has also commented on the legitimating role of universities. He notes that "the university and in a general

¹⁰ See, for example, Curtis 1988; Graff 1976; Katz 1968; Schechter 1977; Sellers 1991 and Spring 1986.

way, all teaching systems, which appear simply to disseminate knowledge, are made to maintain a certain social class in power; and to exclude the instruments of power of another social class” (cited in Chomsky and Foucault 2006: 40).

In the early 1960s, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) reached similar conclusions about the legitimating role of universities. In their 1962 “Port Huron Statement,” SDS leaders describe how university education teaches students to accept social hierarchies:

The university ‘prepares’ the student for ‘citizenship’ through perpetual rehearsals and, usually, through emasculation of what creative spirit there is in the individual ... The specialization of function and knowledge [contributes to] a discontinuous and truncated understanding, by students, of the surrounding social order; a loss of personal attachment, by nearly all, to the worth of study as a humanistic enterprise ... the actual intellectual effect of the college experience is hardly distinguishable from that of any other communications channel – say, a television set – passing on the stock truths of the day ... With administrators ordering the institutions, and faculty the curriculum, the student learns by his isolation to accept elite rule within the university, which prepares him to accept later forms of minority control.

SDS leaders believed that a key function of the university was to produce obedient employees who did their assigned work without questioning its goals. In their view, both the form and content of university education – including practices such as rank ordering and grading of students – functioned to legitimate social stratification.¹¹

How these legitimation and control processes work in higher education has also been studied by Jeff Schmidt (2000). In *Disciplined Minds*, Schmidt argues that university training (and especially professional training) constitutes a system that “turns

¹¹ The political activities of the SDS and other student alliances were one reason why the Trilateral Commission – a global elite policy-planning group – issued stern warnings about the “crisis of democracy” several years later (Crozier, Huntington and Watanuki 1975). The “crisis,” as the Commission explained it, resulted from too much democracy, which included a failure on the part of those institutions responsible for “the indoctrination of the young.” The fact that educational institutions were explicitly equated with performing an indoctrination function is another reminder of the way that many elites view the role of education in democratic societies.

potentially independent thinkers into politically subordinate clones” (p. 4). Using examples from law, medicine and physics, Schmidt documents how higher education’s hidden curriculum produces managerial and intellectual workers who are ideally suited for occupational hierarchies. For Schmidt, those who continue to challenge economic and social relations are usually “weeded out,” while those who remain are too intellectually and politically timid to challenge the status quo.¹² As Schmidt’s analysis of professional education suggests, the role and function of universities is connected to the more general issue of the role of intellectuals in society. In fact, there is considerable critical scholarship on the role intellectuals play in perpetuating systems of domination.

Service Intellectuals

Scholars from diverse fields have examined the specific social role of intellectuals as a way to illustrate the close association between universities and external power. In the West today, the vast majority of intellectuals (and tenured professors in particular) work under conditions of enormous political freedom and security. For this privileged minority, liberal democracy provides freedom as well as “the leisure, the facilities and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ideology, and class interest through which the events of current history are presented” (Chomsky 1987a: 60). It goes without saying that the moral responsibility to oppose social injustice is greater for people whose societies are free and open, and even greater for those who obtain positions of privilege within those societies.

¹² Upon the publication of *Disciplined Minds* (2000), the American Institute of Physics fired Schmidt from his position as Associate Editor at *Physics Today* magazine. After 750 physicists and other academics signed a public letter denouncing his dismissal, Schmidt was then reinstated, in addition to receiving a substantial cash settlement.

While many intellectuals – located inside and outside of the academy – have dedicated their lives to a kind of calling to advance social justice, evidence suggests that this is the exception rather than the rule. The dominant social role of intellectuals is (and has been) to serve power. In fact, this role is implicit in the way that the status of “intellectual” is normally reserved for individuals who have attained positions of power and respectability within society’s dominant institutions, and who function as doctrinal managers in support of those institutions.¹³ Individuals who refuse to occupy these positions are rarely afforded the status of “intellectual” within the mainstream. This tendency can be traced back over time. Writing in the 1800s, Karl Marx observed that those who controlled the material means of production also controlled the mental means of production. As a result, he said, in every historical period the ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class. Following Marx, Antonio Gramsci (1971) understood “hegemony” as the process by which the ruling class dominated through ideology, or its capacity to persuade subordinate classes to accept and internalize its values and concerns. For Gramsci, the key agents in the promotion of hegemony were intellectuals, who he termed “experts in legitimation.”

Other noted historical figures have come to the same conclusion. Julien Benda (1930), for example, popularized the phrase *la trahaison des clercs* to describe the betrayal of intellectuals who advanced their own self-interest by serving as apologists for power. Some years later, George Orwell criticized the “voluntary censorship” of the English press and intellectual classes. Orwell observed that although the methods were

¹³ As Antonio Gramsci (1971) has argued, all people are intellectuals because they have intellectual and rational faculties, but not all people have the *social function* of intellectuals. In other words, the status of “intellectual” is only marginally related to intellectual ability or achievement.

different, the restrictions on freedom of thought and expression in the West were similar in character to the formal censorship in totalitarian states.¹⁴ Unpopular ideas can be silenced, he wrote, and inconvenient facts kept in the dark by service intellectuals, without the need for an official ban. Other writers (e.g., Chomsky 1982, 1987a, 1987b; Mills 1959, 1963 and Said 1994, 2004) further politicized the nature of intellectual work by challenging dominant theoretical paradigms that separate the intellectual's role from issues of class, politics and power. These analyses are among the most suggestive examinations to date of just how pervasive ideology and indoctrination are within educational institutions and the broader intellectual culture.

Of course, the extent to which intellectuals support or challenge sources of power varies by individual, within different areas of study, and over distinct time periods. For example, many academic intellectuals became more socially and politically engaged during the social uprisings of the 1960s, and many social movements of the period – including the student, feminist, civil-rights and anti-war movements – were anchored in the universities. Prior to the emergence of these movements, Roszak (1967: 12-13) argued that the academy was in a state of “entrenched social irrelevance, so highly developed that it would be comic if it were not sufficiently serious in its implications to stand condemned as an act of criminal delinquency.” Nevertheless, it is important to note that, overall, the professoriate was largely uninvolved in campus and off-campus activism in the 1960s. In the US, for example, the Carnegie Commission found that just 5 percent of 60,000 professors surveyed in 1969 self-identified as “radical” (Ladd and Lipset

¹⁴ The popularity of *Animal Farm* (1945) had much to do with its usefulness in discrediting communism and the Soviet Union. The original introduction to the book, however, was directed at critiquing the subservience of the Western press and intellectual community. This introduction was not included in the published volume and was only discovered in the author's original typescript years later.

1975).¹⁵ When considering the social role of intellectuals, the situation today remains largely unchanged. Despite claims that universities have been taken over by the radical forces of leftism,¹⁶ few academics are radicals and most radicals are not dissidents. In a recent national study of over 600,000 US professors, sociologists Neil Gross and Solon Simmons (2007) found that an overwhelming majority of professors hold political views that fall safely within the mainstream.¹⁷

How do we account for the fact that so many academics assume a commissarial rather than a subversive social role? In most cases, it is not a result of direct intervention by corporations, governments or university administrators to control intellectual activity. Rather, intellectuals tend to align their goals and activities with outside power out of their own free choice. For some, this decision reflects a desire to achieve power or to share in

¹⁵ Of the roughly 10,000 political scientists in US universities, only a few dozen (mostly unknown junior faculty) were sponsors of the National Teach-in Committee in 1965 (Windmiller 1967). And, contrary to conventional wisdom, most intellectuals (and the educated classes generally) were supportive of the US war in Vietnam (see, for example, Andrews 1976; Chomsky 1992; Kadushin 1974). Many US academics were also discovered to be working on topics such as counterinsurgency and other “lethal research” for the State Department, the CIA and the Pentagon (Said 1996). Historically speaking, intellectual classes have always functioned as apologists of war. During World War One, for instance, the few prominent dissenting intellectuals – for example Bertrand Russell, Eugene Debs and Rosa Luxemburg – were imprisoned. During this period, some US intellectuals offered themselves to President Woodrow Wilson to carry out a task called “historical engineering,” meaning designing the facts of history in order to serve state policy (Chomsky 1988). It was also around this time that liberal democratic theorists began to discuss the importance of “the manufacture of consent” as a means of controlling the population in societies where the state lacked the requisite ability to use force or violence (e.g., Lippmann 1922). Along these same lines, Alex Carey (1997: 145) documented how US business leaders provided enormous sums of money to social scientists for research into public relations, industrial psychology and “the measurement, development and change of attitudes and opinions.” The goal, according to Carey, was to mitigate the threats of the “welfare state, socialism, collectivism and associated disasters” within the US. To aid in the tasks of historical engineering and the manufacture of consent today, Canadian academics have received millions of dollars from the Department of National Defence for projects committed to shaping public perceptions of the military and the war in Afghanistan (Attaran 2008).

¹⁶ See, for example, Roger Kimball’s *Tenured Radicals* (1990) Dinesh D’Souza’s *Illiberal Education* (1991), Ben Shapiro’s *Brainwashed* (2004), David Horowitz’s *The Professors* (2006) and *One-Party Classroom* (2009) by Horowitz and Jacob Laksin.

¹⁷ Today, Ellen Schrecker (2010) estimates that there may be, at most, a few thousand radicals or “non-conformists” among the 1.3 million teachers in US colleges and universities. The situation in Canada or other Western democracies does not differ in any meaningful respect.

its rewards.¹⁸ For others, institutional pressures – residing in the disciplinary organization of knowledge and the professional reward structure – provide a subtle but effective screening mechanism. According to Barry Checkoway (2001), academia conditions faculty to believe that social and political engagement are not part of their jobs and that academic allegiances should remain with one’s discipline or professional field. Similarly, there are few professional rewards for public service; service to society is given little if any weight in professional decisions about job performance, promotion or tenure. Moreover, within the academic “cult of professionalism,” as Said (1994) describes it, research that advances a strong position on social issues is not often regarded as professional scholarship in comparison with research that exhibits “balance,” “moderation” and apolitical detachment. Commenting on the types of research taking place in the social sciences, Mills (1959) argued that research had been polarized into (i) “grand theory;” academic theorizing removed from social considerations, and (ii) “abstracted empiricism,” where the acquisition of empirical knowledge is divorced from issues of power and social justice, and that both involved a failure on the part of intellectuals to critically evaluate social life and to prioritize the needs of vulnerable populations.

Given this context, it is not surprising that most academics do not assume subversive roles. It is also not surprising that so many important scholarly contributions come from individuals outside of the academy. In the words of former Harvard President

¹⁸ As Chomsky (1987b: 83) puts it: “If it is plausible that ideology will in general serve as a mask for self-interest, then it is a natural presumption that intellectuals, in interpreting history or formulating policy, will tend to adopt an elitist position, condemning popular movements and mass participation in decision-making, and emphasizing rather the necessity for supervision by those who possess the knowledge and understanding that is required (so they claim) to manage society and control social change.”

Derrick Bok (1990: 105), “[w]hat Rachel Carson did for risks to the environment, Ralph Nader for consumer protection, Michael Harrington for problems of poverty, Betty Friedan for women’s rights, they did as independent critics, not as members of a faculty.”¹⁹

To conclude, critical scholars focus on how elite actors influence and control education in order to maintain the existing social order. However, this understanding of the connections between universities and external sources of power is partial and incomplete. Institutions of higher education have never simply reflected the imposition of elite rule nor are they the mere instruments of dominant social group. In part, this is because universities must retain a certain degree of freedom and independence in order to provide the knowledge and skills needed to sustain an advanced industrial society. Moreover, it is impossible for universities to transmit high-level cognitive skills without, at the same time, developing critical capacities and some understanding of the way that power operates. While it is true that higher education functions to incorporate workers into the capitalist economy, it is also true that workers, students and intellectuals have used universities to pursue entirely different objectives. The next section discusses the role that many believe universities can, should and often do perform in society, as well as the inherent tension between this role and dependence on external sources of support.

The Role of Higher Education in Challenging Power

Universities, writes David Noble (2001: 107-108), “have never been the autonomous, disinterested citadel of objective scholarship and social criticism that some lovers of

¹⁹ David Orr (2004: 101) makes a similar point in asking the following questions: “When did an issue of the American Political Science Review cause the comfortable in Congress to squirm? When did an issue of the American Economic Review ever cause the Barons of Wall Street to tremble? ... When was the last time the dispossessed felt befriended by an issue of the American Sociological Review?”

learning imagine ... Nevertheless, the universities have provided a living for moderate dissenters, a vantage point from which to observe critically what is going on outside (if not inside), and a platform from which to address with relative safety controversial social questions.” In Noble’s view, the subversive role of the university should not be exaggerated, but it should also not be dismissed. The university remains the one institution in modern society that explicitly claims, as part of its mission, to raise questions about the social order and offer challenges to society’s most fundamental beliefs.

Throughout history, universities have been expected to teach the “truth” and denounce deception; to liberate the mind from orthodoxy and conventional thought; and to advance democratic and egalitarian concerns, such as social justice and public service. As a result, the university has often been cast as the social critic or conscience of society. It also has been seen as having a key role to play in transforming society; including, for example, through the rise of dedicated curricular programs like labour studies, urban studies and women’s studies.²⁰ From this perspective, universities can and should provide an institutional forum within which to subject institutions and ideologies (including their own) to critical analysis, and, ultimately, to direct challenge. In the words of Henry Giroux, “[h]igher education has always, though within damaged traditions and burdened

²⁰ Sometimes universities have been imbued with almost transcendental qualities. Wilhelm von Humboldt, one of the founders of the modern research university in the early 1800s, defined the university as “nothing other than the spiritual life of those human beings who are moved by external leisure or internal pressures toward learning and research.” Even if the university did not exist formally, Humboldt said, “one person would privately reflect and collect, another join himself to men of his own age, a third find a circle of disciples. Such is the picture to which the state must remain faithful if it wishes to give an institutional form to such indefinite and rather accidental human operations” (Humboldt 1963: 133-134). In *The Idea of the University* (1959), Karl Jaspers also asserts that any meaningful intellectual pursuit must be informed by a concept of “spirit,” which he defined as the potentiality of ideas, the power of creative intuition and the striving of human beings for clarity and insight.

forms, served as both a symbolic and concrete attempt to liberate humanity from the blind obedience to authority and as a reminder that individual and social agency gain meaning primarily through the freedoms guaranteed by the public sphere” (Giroux and Giroux 2004: 12). These subversive and liberating ideals – which include protecting academics and the public from abusive structures of power – have, at times, placed universities in opposition to these external power systems.

Many prominent figures have argued that the university should, first and foremost, act as a site of subversion and liberation. Former US President Thomas Jefferson, for example, claimed that a primary purpose of the academy was to exercise an independent critique of church and state, in order to “unmask their usurpation, and monopolies of honors, wealth and power” (cited in Roszak 1967: 5). Jefferson also believed that public education should prepare citizens to defend themselves from concentrated power and efforts to manipulate and control them (see Jefferson 1779). Centuries later, Mills (1959, 1963) argued that universities should be imbued with a public philosophy committed to radical civic engagement in the interests of social liberation. Mills is also renowned for his claim that higher education – and particularly the “sociological imagination” – should support individuals to locate “private troubles” within the broader context of public issues and issues of power. Similar sentiments can be found in the writings of Claude Bissell, onetime President of Carleton University and the University of Toronto. By no means politically radical, Bissell (1968: 24) saw universities, at their core, as institutions of political engagement. In his view, apathetic intellectual communities that lacked a “passionate concern for the general good” were tantamount to a “malignant disease.” Even John Henry Newman (1852), who famously argued that liberal education and the

intrinsic value of knowledge production were at the heart of the university's mission believed that higher education can and should improve society. For Newman, students who understood the practice of reasoned inquiry were expected to use it as members of the community.²¹

Related to these views, some have argued that universities should impart future generations with humanistic values. Russell, for one, claimed that a primary goal of education is “to give a sense of the value of things other than domination, to help create wise citizens of a free community [and] to encourage a combination of citizenship with liberty” (cited in Chomsky 2003: 9). Similarly, John Dewey (1966) claimed that higher education should produce “humanistic knowledge,” or a form of knowledge that directly enhanced the possibilities for social change. For Dewey, knowledge is humanistic in quality only because of “what it *does* in liberating human intelligence and human sympathy. Any subject matter which accomplishes this result is humane, and any subject matter which does not accomplish it is not even educational” (p. 230). Murray Ross (1969), the first president of York University, also defined higher learning as a “humanizing” enterprise, one that developed students’ capacities to be “deeply moved

²¹ In Newman’s words: “Training of the intellect, which is best for the individual himself, best enables him to discharge his duties to society ... If then a practical end must be assigned to a university course, I say it is that of training good members of society. Its art is the art of social life, and its end is fitness for the world ... a university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspiration, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age” (Newman 1959: 191-192). *The Idea of a University*, published by Newman in 1852, is emblematic of contemporary scholarly interest in universities of the past, as well as the long standing question of what universities should be. Since Newman’s time, an abundance of academic work has been fashioned on the same theme, often with a similar title. Examples include Karl Jaspers’ (1959) *The Idea of the University*; Robert Wolff’s (1969) *The Ideal of the University*; James Cameron’s (1978) *On the Idea of a University*; and Jaroslav Pelikan’s (1992) *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination*.

and profoundly influenced by the thoughts, feelings, and activities of other people,” as well as society’s most pressing problems (p. 172).

As discussed above, critical theorists argue that a core function of higher education is to produce obedient thinkers that carry out their assigned work without questioning its goals. In contrast, many argue that universities can and should perform the opposite function. As Chomsky explains, universities should equip students to confront the fact that their future work as professionals is connected to the exercise of power, and that the nature of this work always involves political decisions that affect the lives of others (see Chapter 8 in Rai 1995). Engineers, for example, should be sensitive to the social and environmental consequences of their projects; scientists should have the ability to recognize the harmful applications of their discoveries; and doctors should have a grasp of the workings of the pharmaceutical industry. In other words, universities should make it difficult for young people to avoid facing their responsibilities by creating an intellectual climate that encourages debate over the moral considerations of professional work. Without a commitment to these educational goals, universities become a training ground for what Max Weber (1958: 182) called “specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart,” which are ostensibly individuals who are unable or unwilling to take principled moral action in the course of their occupational careers.

In order for universities to fulfill their subversive and liberating responsibilities, it follows that their priorities cannot be controlled by special interests. In the words of J.A. Corry (1970: 56), former President of Queen’s University, universities are at their worst when they are “badgered, intimidated and directed by clamorous agencies or towering authorities external to themselves.” Similarly, economist John Kenneth Galbraith (2007:

542) asserted that only independent universities, acting as centres of opposition and criticism, could be the “necessary force for skepticism, emancipation, and pluralism” that was required in the new industrial age. Early Renaissance thinkers also argued that there was an inherent contradiction between service to power and the spirit of critical inquiry, and that scholarship must be free of external constraints in order to explore the full range of human beliefs and actions. If “freedom” is not an option, universities are expected to strive towards independence to the greatest extent possible in order to address public concerns.

Most of what has been discussed here about the subversive and liberating role of the university also applies to intellectuals. While some scholars have drawn attention to the servile role of intellectuals, others focus on their liberating role. Commenting on the responsibility of intellectuals, George Fallis (2008) argues that the democratic mission of the public university requires academics to accept the role of public intellectual. In other words, academic freedom does not merely allow for social criticism, it demands it. For Fallis, intellectuals are required – and often do – participate in public life and make their research and writing accessible to popular audiences. Edward Said (1994) goes further by arguing that like universities, the social role of the intellectual should be subversive. For Said, the responsibility of intellectuals is to “raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose *raison d'être* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug” (p. 11). In keeping with this stream of thought, intellectuals can and should be a key source of social critique and analysis.

Few would contest that public intellectuals have had a long tradition of disseminating knowledge for the purposes of expanding public consciousness and producing specialized knowledge to support practices of social liberation. Prominent scientists in the early 1900s, for example, produced popular works in physics and mathematics in the belief that this knowledge should be shared by everyone (e.g., Lancelot Hogben's *Mathematics for the Million* 1936). Popular education in the form of community development and workers' education programs and other alternatives to formal schooling are also part of this tradition. In some cases, these movements succeeded in creating separate working class schools (see the writings of A.J. Muste in Hentoff 1967). In the area of higher education, the early twentieth-century US Intercollegiate Socialist Society, known for its "ability to mediate the general domination of colleges by business interests," forged important alliances between the academy and movements for industrial democracy (Barrow 1990: 179).

Building on these kinds of contributions, public intellectuals also serve as a resource of information and analysis to support popular movements and provide a basis for sustained, engaged citizenship. As Mills (1959: 186) describes it, intellectuals can help people to become "self-educating" individuals, at the same time as helping society to build "self-cultivating publics." Put another way, intellectuals play a key role in helping people recognize and critique – independently and for themselves – prevailing structures of power. All of these tasks require that intellectuals take their subversive responsibilities seriously. In the words of Chris Hedges (2010: 35),

genuine intellectual inquiry is always subversive. It challenges cultural and political assumptions. It critiques structures. It is relentlessly self-critical. It implodes the self-indulgent myths and stereotypes we use to aggrandize

ourselves and ignore our complicity in acts of violence and oppression. And genuine inquiry always makes the powerful, as well as their liberal apologists, deeply uncomfortable.

For academic intellectuals, the production of self-educating citizens and self-cultivating publics means that the moral and political stakes of participating in an oppressive social order should be made clear to students. It is not unreasonable to expect that intellectuals should also provide students (and others) with a means of defending themselves against the distortions and illusions of the dominant intellectual culture. In order to accomplish these tasks, intellectuals – like universities – must remain independent of external power, to the greatest extent that they can.

To summarize, universities are liberating and subversive institutions just as they are institutions of legitimation and social control. While some see the university as reliant on external power and, therefore, incapable of doing much more than supporting a particular set of interests, others embrace the widely held assumption that universities play a critical role in challenging systems of power and authority, regardless (and in spite) of who they depend on for support. This dual role has been a source of considerable tension, both for those who work and study within these institutions and for those who critique them. Over the past century, the growing relationship between universities and corporations has only increased these tensions. In the next section, I look more specifically at the beginnings of the “corporate university” and the relationship between universities and business power by examining the views of some of its earliest critics.

Early Critics of the Corporate University

For some time, there have been debates about the public service role of universities, and the tensions inherent in fulfilling this role in the context of external sources of power, be it the church, the state or the market. The purpose of this section is to review some of the early commentary on the intrusion of business values and practices into higher education, in both the United States and Canada, in order to provide an important contextual backdrop for this study of corporatization in the current period.

Debates about higher education in the US in the first half of the twentieth century were often concerned with the impact of corporations and corporate power. During this period, contested political discussions over who “owned the universities” were commonplace (Barrow 1990: 32). These conflicts were understood as a battle over who would control the direction of university reform, and, with it, economic development. For the US business community, universities were viewed as a key industrial resource and essential for corporate expansion. For others, however, the growing collaboration between universities and industry was a cause for deep concern. Randolph Bourne, one of the earliest critics of business influence in higher education, likened the university’s role in this period to that of a “financial corporation, strictly analogous, in its motives and responses, to the corporation which is concerned in the production of industrial commodities ... The university produces learning instead of steel and rubber, but the nature of the academic commodity has become less and less potent in ensuring for the academic workman a status materially different from that of any other kind of employee.” Under the control of business-minded trustees, Bourne said, the American university had shifted “from its old, noble ideal of a community of scholarship” to a private commercial

enterprise (cited in Chomsky 2003: 183). Other work substantiates Bourne's concern surrounding the role of trustees in reshaping US higher education. Earl McGrath (1936), for example, reported that bankers and business leaders on governing boards increased from approximately one quarter of total membership in 1860 to one half in 1930. Scott Nearing's study of trustees in 1917 revealed a similar trend; of approximately 2,500 trustees in 143 institutions across the country, more than half were professionals and over one-third were merchants, manufacturers, corporate officials or bankers.²²

Journalist Upton Sinclair (1923) also challenged the growing relationship between US universities and corporations. Like those before him, Sinclair's critique drew attention to business influence through trustee control and the suppression of academic freedom, but he also called into question the fact that universities were actively embracing a corporate service role. To publicize the corporate affiliations of many of the nation's top schools, he used labels like, Chicago as the University of Standard Oil and Columbia as the University of J.P. Morgan. He was also highly critical of Stanford University which, he pointed out, had once employed Thorstein Veblen, arguably the most well-known critic of business power in higher education during the time period.

Writing in the early 1900s, Veblen condemned the expansion of professional/vocational training in universities, and equated this shift with a "cult of business principles" and a betrayal of the university's mission (see Veblen 2004: 137).

²² Similar conclusions are provided by Hubert Beck (1947) and George Counts (1927). To complement their control over boards of trustees, some corporate leaders, like those in the utility industry, actively participated in other campaigns to control higher education. In the early 1930s, for example, the US Federal Trade Commission discovered that the utility companies "were hiring college professors; subsidizing utilities courses in colleges; subsidizing research work ... reviewing and editing textbooks; seconding company personnel to college faculties; controlling university extension work; saturating schools with utilities-company propaganda against public ownership; and even conducting summer schools for faculty members" (Noble 1977: 256).

For him, “practicality” in education was not only a contradiction in terms but a euphemism for private gain, where business proficiency was exhibited as enlightenment, “value” was synonymous with pecuniary value and citizenship was reduced to a form of barbarism.²³ Veblen was particularly concerned that universities were expanding vocational programs (at the expense of the liberal arts) at the behest of purposeful business campaigns and with support from business-friendly administrators. He explained the purpose of this approach as twofold: (i) to dispense with courses of study deemed “useless” or obsolete and (ii) to acquire trained employees “at a rate of wages lower than what they would have to pay in the absence of such gratuitous instruction” (p. 132). Although liberal education remained “the enduring purpose and substantial interest of the university establishment,” Veblen argued that business values and practices were systematically destroying it (p. 43).²⁴

Like Bourne and Sinclair, Veblen also observed the influence of corporate power on university governing boards, whose discretionary control over policy came to rest “finally

²³ For these reasons, liberal and professional education was opposed. In Veblen’s words: “The divergent lines of interest to be taken care of by the professional schools and the university, respectively, are as widely out of touch as may well be within the general field of human knowledge. The one is animated wholly by considerations of material expediency, and the range of its interest and efforts is strictly limited by consideration of the useful effect to which the proficiency that it gives is to be turned; the other knows nothing of expediency, and is influenced by no consideration of utility or disutility, in its appreciation of the knowledge to be sought . . . The two are incommensurably at variance so far as regards their purpose, and in great measure also as regards their methods of work, and necessarily so” (Veblen 2004: 20).

²⁴ Veblen was correct that business leaders in the United States opposed the ideals of liberal learning. As Frank Donoghue (2008) explains, corporate dissatisfaction with higher education began when “the great capitalists of the early twentieth century saw in America’s universities a set of core values and a management style antithetical to their own” (p. 2). In part, this antagonism reflected their belief that universities were not conducive to wealth creation. However, this particular concern did not account for the “intensity, bordering on outrage, of their critiques,” which were more fundamentally rooted in “distrust of the ideal of intellectual inquiry for its own sake” and the principles of collegial governance (p. 3). As business criteria began to assert a greater influence over social and intellectual life, the term “academic” was increasingly associated with useless or impractical pursuits. This critique has never been one-sided. As Robert Nisbet (1971: 53) puts it, the academy has always held a “certain, noticeable, disdain for the businessman . . . nothing would have so offended a bona fide prince of learning as to have been mistaken somewhere for a mere man of trade and commerce.”

in the hands of businessmen” (p. 44). For Veblen, business representation on governing boards was self-serving and pernicious: “they have ceased to exercise any function other than a bootless meddling with academic matters which they do not understand. The sole ground of their retention appears to be an unreflecting deferential concession to the usages of corporate organization and control” (p. 46).²⁵ But Veblen’s critique went deeper. From his perspective, the encroachment of business principles compromised higher education completely. In other words, he saw a fundamental incompatibility between business enterprise and higher learning, such that they should be considered polar opposites or “two extremes.” As Veblen explained it, “within the ordinary range of lawful occupations these two lines of endeavour, and the animus that belongs to each, are as wildly out of touch as may be. They are the two extreme terms of the modern cultural scheme” (p. 50).

According to Veblen, academic governance, research and teaching were among the casualties of this new and more intimate relationship between universities and corporations. For example, he claimed that administrators were fixated on fundraising at the expense of academic priorities; research was an adjunct of the industrial system; and teaching was infected by the elevation of impersonal, mechanical relations in the place of personal guidance. The consequences of this new relationship, in his view, were so far reaching that it left its mark on the “ideals, aims, methods and standards” of scholars and scholarship (p. 7). From the perspective of higher learning, Veblen considered these developments “wholly untoward, not to say disastrous” (p. 178).

²⁵ For an overview of Veblen’s views about how corporate business practices impacted university governance, see Johnson (2010).

Following the early critiques of Veblen and others who were writing about the changes taking place in US higher education, critics of corporate-university ties also emerged in Canada. For instance, Harold Innis, one of Canada's most respected economists, warned in 1946 that universities would be severely compromised if business gained more influence over their operations. In fact, Innis argued that many Canadian universities had already abandoned their commitment to the impartial search for truth and disinterested knowledge production, and that, in their place, administrators were beholden to departments and lines of inquiry that generated external funding. Innis was especially concerned about the impact on the social sciences, which, he believed, needed to be independent of outside influence.²⁶ Summarizing his position on corporate-university relations, Innis wrote: "The impression that universities can be bought and sold, held by businessmen and fostered by university administrators trained in playing for the highest bid, is a reflection of the deterioration of western civilization. To buy universities is to destroy them ... The descent of the university into the market place reflects the lie in the soul of modern society" (pp. 75-76).

One can also find traces of early criticism in the writings of prominent Canadian administrators, such as Claude Bissell (1968). As would be expected, Bissell did not believe that universities should reject business prerogatives; he argued that "isolation from the world of corporate enterprise would condemn the university to a twilight world of self-bemused impotence" (pp. 208-209). Bissell was also critical of the student movement, especially the more radical elements that put forward, what he called, an

²⁶ At the time, Innis argued, specialized and applied research contracts were starting to replace financial and other support for independent scholarship, which had impacts on the nature and extent of the work taking place in the social science domains.

“apocalyptic gospel” of university demise (p. 123). Nevertheless, Bissell was concerned about the influence of corporations in many areas of university life, especially the curriculum. Speaking of the US, Bissell claimed that business-university linkages could be seen “most disastrously in the increasing domination of American universities by the undergraduate school of business, which is frankly and unabashedly a training ground for the large corporation” (pp. 170-171). The danger, according to Bissell, was that business and management studies were “usurping a central and dominating position in the undergraduate curriculum” at the expense of basic arts and sciences. More broadly, Bissell was troubled by a general shift in the way that higher education was perceived:

Other evidences of the impact of business upon the educational world – evidences more subtle, but perhaps even more pervasive – can be found in a good deal of the high-level discussion that goes on about higher education. Much of this discussion is based upon the theory that the university is a sort of production line, and that its sole function is accomplished when it has turned out well-packaged products for the corporation super-market (pp. 171-172).

During this period, students in the US, Canada and elsewhere began to organize efforts to increase their influence over university affairs, including through calling for reforms to the content and organization of university education. In particular, students demanded to be involved (some demanded veto power) over university decisions that involved corporations. These decisions included the solicitation of private grants and research funding, the practice of corporate recruiting on campus and the university’s role in the military-industrial complex (see, for example, Reid and Reid 1969). As part of this struggle, students also rejected the notion that the university should function as an isolated ivory tower that was detached from social and political affairs. They demanded that the university take its critical function seriously and address social justice issues and

problems related to racial, class and gender inequalities, as well as civil rights, war and militarism. As a result, university “relevance” became a sort of watchword for the movement. For these students, relevance meant immediate practical engagement with pressing social issues (in contrast, university “relevance” from a corporate perspective is typically synonymous with a form of education that emphasizes narrow, specialized training and research in the service of private interests).

Student concerns about university relevance went hand-in-hand with a rejection of the “corporate university” – euphemistically referred to as the “knowledge factory” – where campus relations resembled those of a business establishment. Embracing the work of critical scholars like Herbert Marcuse (1964) and Paul Goodman (1959), students argued that higher education had been subverted by narrow and instrumental concerns. As Robert Nisbet (1971: 111) explains, large numbers of students in the 1960s were disillusioned by campuses that were “not community but corporation, led not by aristocrats but businessmen of the mind.” Who, they asked, gave wealthy corporate leaders the right to remake universities in their own image?

In the US, the 1964 “Machine” speech by Mario Savio – a prominent member of the Berkeley free speech movement – exemplified growing discontent with the encroachment of the knowledge factory. Savio’s speech likened the university to an industrial machine, its Board of Regents to a board of directors, and students to raw materials that were packaged and sold to external clients (Lustig 2000). Interestingly, the talk took place in the administration building of Clark Kerr, then President of the University of California. In *The Uses of the University*, first published in 1962, Kerr famously argued that the traditional university had evolved into a “multiversity.” He

characterized the multiversity as actively embracing multiple constituencies and assuming a more practical and commercial role; like corporate conglomerates, he saw multiversities as serving numerous markets by involving themselves in virtually every sphere of economic activity. In Kerr's eyes, the multiversity was being called upon to "merge its activities with industry as never before" (p. 86), which he generally looked upon in favourable terms.²⁷ Just as critiques arose in response to corporate influence in the university, the specific concept of the multiversity also came into question. Robert Wolff (1969), for example, contended that a key problem with Kerr's vision of the multiversity – a problem that was also recognized and critiqued by the student movement – was his failure to distinguish between social need and market demand. For Kerr, the demands to which the multiversity "must" respond involved adjusting higher education to meet the needs of external power, rather than the social needs of the population. As Wolff (1969: 40) pointed out, Kerr assumed without question that the multiversity should accept the priorities of whoever "has the money to pay for them. Instead of calling his essay *The Uses of the University*, he could more appropriately have titled it *University for Hire!*"

This notion of the multiversity – and the critiques it has generated – is important for many reasons, including that it foreshadowed the current, more complete reorganization of universities under corporatization. It is also important to note that this and other early critiques of the corporate university focus on the fundamental incongruity between the competing and, in some instances, contradictory goals and defining principles of

²⁷ It is worth noting that the recent proliferation of corporate-university linkages led Kerr to modify his views to some degree in later years. In his most recent edition of *The Uses of the University* (2001), Kerr noted that greater corporate influence over the goals and practices of universities has had a detrimental impact on liberal education. In his words: "Education for its own sake is being replaced by education for the sake of employment ... The ivory tower of old has become an arm of the state and an arm of industry ... What are perceived by some as the injustices in the external labor market penetrate the system of economic rewards on campus, replacing policies of internal justice" (pp. 214-215).

corporate and academic institutions. This tension – between the role and interests of universities and corporations – is something that will be repeated throughout this study, given its continuing importance in the contemporary context.

In the final section of the chapter, I focus on changes that occurred in Canada's university system during the “golden age” of university expansion in the 1960s, which overlapped with and followed the commentary of these early critics.

Between Capitalism and Democracy: Reflections on the “Golden Age”

Many contend that today's “corporatized” universities are distinct from those of the past period when universities were relatively free of corporate influence. In Canada, the major period of university growth and expansion in the 1960s is often referred to as the “golden age” of higher education. In the “golden age,” university reform was influenced both by democratic and public service commitments as well as economic considerations. On the one hand, then, university reform was shaped by popular movements inside and outside of the academy as well as the values and goals of a burgeoning public sector. At the same time, university expansion was influenced by the economic interests of corporations and the interventions of government and business elites.

According to Janice Newson (1998), universities in the 1960s were cautious about being tied too closely to the market. In other words, their democratic commitments were considered as – if not more – important than their economic role. During this period, the expansion of higher education was viewed as a means to promote social and economic mobility, extend the rights of democratic citizenship and advance public knowledge.

There was also some momentum to move beyond equality of opportunity to promote the

principle of universal access to higher education. For example, the 1972 Commission on Post-Secondary Education in Ontario stated that the

guiding principle of the Province's policy of financing post-secondary education should continue to be *universal access* to appropriate educational services for all who wish and are able to benefit from them. All financial barriers to accessibility should be progressively abolished ... When faced with the imperative need of education for survival, universal access should seem not a benevolent dream but a categorical necessity (cited in Porter, Porter and Blishen 1982: 22, emphasis in original).

This approach to re-shaping the educational sphere was set within the broader context of new social movements, welfare state expansion, the growth of public sector employment and the prominence of Canadian left nationalism.

Prior to and during this period of reform, there was also a growing, somewhat competing, tendency (particularly among government and business leaders) to see the expansion of university education as a primary means of enhancing economic growth and development. In part, this view reflected the increasing dependence of Canadian corporations on scientific and engineering research as well as business management training. Working through organizations like the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Industrial Foundation on Education, corporate leaders organized to advance their own vision of university reform.²⁸ Given that the corporate vision of higher education reform was predicated on system expansion, it aligned in many respects with that of liberal and even radical reformers.

The power of business in influencing educational reform during the golden age was evident in three main areas. First, corporate elites increased their presence on university

²⁸ Corporate organizing efforts were evident in 1955 when the A.V. Roe Company sponsored a conference of Canadian industrialists to discuss the universities' role in providing scientific and technical "manpower" (Cameron 1991).

governing boards as a way to exert influence over university governance, infrastructure and program development (Barkans and Pupo 1974; Clement 1975; Ornstein 1988). Second, the funding relationships between business and education became more significant. According to Axelrod (1982a), business raised its funding for higher education by 450 percent in just one year in the 1950s, with most of the money coming from dominant industrial and commercial sectors.²⁹ However, the business community also recognized that their financial contributions, in isolation, were insufficient to achieve the desired reforms. So third, business leaders, “in unison, called upon government to seize the initiative and meet the national ‘crisis’” (Axelrod 1980-81: 27). They did so by using an extensive lobbying campaign to sell the message that only a massive influx of public education dollars would ensure Canada’s competitive position in the global economy. For example, Canada’s advertising industry launched a coast-to-coast media campaign to inform Canadians that the country faced significant dangers if higher education was not expanded (Fluxgold 1973).

The business community also engaged in a number of activities to force the alignment between higher education and their economic interests. For example, in 1956, partly at the behest of big business, the National Conference of Canadian Universities sponsored the “Canada’s Crisis in Higher Education” conference for representatives from academia, business, government and the labour movement. Much of the discussion at the conference was organized around the financial difficulties facing universities. Building

²⁹ Canadian business leaders explained their increased financial contributions in both ideological and practical terms. Corporate funding, it was claimed, would help to ensure the expansion of business-oriented curricula as well as prevent “total government control over higher education” (Axelrod 1980-81: 28). Other representatives explained business funding as promoting an “understanding and appreciation of the private enterprise way of life” and cultivating “an economic, social, and political climate in which companies ... can survive and continue to progress” (Byleveld 1966: 22).

on these discussions and other business-led efforts, it was declared that there was a major crisis in higher education. In Axelrod's (1986: 46) words, "the very survival of the country was pinned to the expansion of educational facilities." One year later, the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects issued a powerful statement about the economic value of universities, and placed system expansion at the heart of the country's economic development strategy.³⁰

The Economic Council of Canada, which was established in 1963, also promoted this line of argument. In its influential series of *Annual Reviews*, the Council argued that universities were not producing the professional, business or technical skills required in the new economy (see, for example, Economic Council of Canada 1964, 1965). The Council also maintained that a greater supply of post-secondary education was needed to facilitate economic growth. Its overriding message was that education should be viewed primarily as a form of economic investment. To some extent, the views of the Economic Council aligned with those of the Science Council of Canada (created in 1966), who argued that more attention should be placed on the relevance of university research for economic development. At a broader level, increasing wealth and higher living standards across the country also contributed to strengthening the belief in the economic value of

³⁰ In the words of the Commission: "We feel it our bounden duty to call attention as forcefully as we can to the vital part which universities must play in our expanding and increasingly complex economy ... We are concerned with the contribution made by the universities to the increase in the national productivity and wealth of the country. In relation to this aspect of the national welfare Canadian universities occupy a key position. They are the source of the most highly skilled workers whose knowledge is essential in all branches of industry ... we believe that the rate of technical advance in Canada must accelerate if we are to maintain our position in relation to other countries and to achieve the growth of the economy which we have predicted. This means a continuously expanding research effort ... in many areas the scale on which research must be conducted and the elaborate facilities required will necessitate industry cooperation and substantial government participation" (cited in Harris 1976: 587-588).

post-secondary education and the connection between university training and a prosperous economy.

The resulting increased public spending on higher education elicited near unanimous support from the private sector, whose extensive lobbying played a key role in bringing it to fruition. There were also a number of examples of direct corporate involvement in system expansion, especially for newer institutions with large capital expenditures (Pupo 1978). For example, in some areas of the country, business leaders were involved in preparing proposals for new campuses, overseeing their implementation and influencing university policies. According to Axelrod (1982a: 55), national and local business interests played a “vital role” in the creation and expansion of virtually every Ontario university during this period (e.g., Brock, Guelph, York and Trent). Other universities bypassed the development of full or expanded curriculums built around basic arts and sciences in favour of more specialized programming. Examples include Waterloo and the Université du Québec. As James MacAulay (1984: 68) explains, as interactions with business became more commonplace within these specialized institutions, they “readily adopted industry as their clientele for an expanding range of services.” One of the best illustrations of how university expansion came to reflect economic interests was the establishment of Athabasca University in 1970. Upon its creation, Athabasca developed a “radical” mandate that merged the demands of education and vocational training to support corporate industry. It also developed a distinctly consumerist

orientation spearheaded by distance education programs with little academic control over planning.³¹

For the business community, a healthy supply of skilled workers in engineering, business management and the applied sciences had obvious benefits. But as Axelrod (1986: 52-53) explains, “[t]hose who viewed the importance of higher education in primarily economic terms included arts programs in their prescriptions. In virtually every major industrial and commercial enterprise, businessmen were firm in their conviction that a student’s study of the liberal arts was as vital to the well-being of the economy as was specific professional training.” In other words, the requirements of a flexible and adaptable white-collar workforce necessitated the expansion of business and science as well as liberal arts education. Here, the position of business leaders coincided with those of many academics and the public who argued that these programs should be expanded. The arts benefited, according to Axelrod, “on the coattails of a university system designed primarily to serve economic ends.”

Not surprisingly, and reflecting both economic and democratic visions of higher education, the country’s university system expanded in multiple directions during this era. Undergraduate enrolment increased five-fold between 1955 and 1975, while graduate enrolment grew by a factor of twelve (Hardy 1984). Eighteen new universities were founded between 1959 and 1969 alone (Tudiver 1999). To accommodate campus growth and the large influx of new students, the number of full-time university teachers increased

³¹ Marco Adria (2000: 585) explains that a key goal of the new university was to “establish its identity as a consumerist model of education,” where “the student exercises the prerogatives of a shopper, choosing which courses to pursue and when.” The model was articulated in the language of “innovation,” which in practice meant service to power. The early vocational and consumer orientation of Athabasca would become an important precursor for eventual changes in Canada’s university system.

from approximately 6,500 in 1960 to nearly 25,000 in 1970 (Fisher et al. 2006). In terms of funding, universities' share of provincial education budgets increased from 16 percent in 1960 to 24.7 percent in 1967-68 (Tudiver 1999). At the national level, university expenditures in Canada rose from 0.36 percent of GNP in 1956 to 2.09 percent in 1970 (Ornstein 1988); overall, Canada was spending more than 7 percent of its GNP on education in 1973, more than most other Western nations (Hardy 1984). By 1970-71, government grants accounted for 76 percent of university operating revenues. In comparison, private donations comprised less than 10 percent. These same figures in the United States were 43 and 36.5 percent, respectively (Axelrod 2002).

In addition to the growth of campuses, facilities, enrolment and funding, university curriculums were expanded to reflect more flexibility in undergraduate studies and an increase in student choice over courses and programs. At the same time, universities increased the provision of general liberal arts education (the proportion of undergraduate degrees in the arts and social sciences rose from 46.8 percent in 1960-61 to over 60 percent in 1968-69). According to Alan Sears (2003: 53), this shift “reflected the need for a flexible white-collar workforce but it also reflected a conception of citizenship and character-development in which jobs skills were not the only consideration.”³² Echoing the principle of broad accessibility, student assistance plans were improved to support increased enrolment. Total government loans for full-time undergraduates (including

³² In the 1960s and 1970s, there was a strong link between university education and public sector employment. From 1961 to 1971, for example, employment in non-commercial services (such as health, education, welfare and public administration) more than doubled. According to Joel Novak (1985), studies of university graduates in the 1970s showed that their employment patterns were markedly “skewed” in favour of the public sector.

CEGEPs) increased from \$1 million in 1957-58 to \$58.7 million 1969-70 (Tudiver 1999). The Canada Student Loan program was created in 1964.

Under the growing leadership of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, faculty also gained more control over university governance. Academics expanded their representation in senate bodies and new systems of peer review offered more input into hiring, tenure and promotion decisions. In many universities, faculty associations were created or strengthened to advance the professional interests and the organizational capacity of academic labour. Partly as a result of these changes, faculty salaries doubled, working conditions improved and the idea of collegial self-governance assumed a concrete (albeit relatively weak) institutional form (Neatby 1985). Students also gained some power within universities by acquiring representation on departmental committees, faculty councils, senates, and, in some cases, boards of governors. All of these advances were achieved within a broader political framework that emphasized the need for universities to be more independent of external power. This need was exemplified by the importance attached to institutional autonomy, collegial self-governance and academic freedom.

The expansion that took place over this time period was driven by three main factors. First, as explained above, one contributing factor was the corporate interest in creating a skilled labour force and a university system that would support capitalist growth and development. Second, governments supported university expansion and other changes – including improved salaries and working conditions for academics – based on the expectation that these would correspond with sizeable economic returns. And third, broader social movements and democratic forces shaped the system in significant ways;

improved educational opportunities, broader accessibility and the strengthening of the university's public service role were widely viewed as social goods in and of themselves. While these three forces, combined, brought about significant expansion, the narrative that this was a "golden age" of Canadian higher education is misleading. For one, significant challenges remained evident within the university during this period. In Canada and elsewhere, there were major constraints on academic freedom and the free pursuit of knowledge, larger fundamental social inequities were reproduced in the university context, and problematic linkages existed between academic research and agendas supporting war and domination. At the same time, many of the changes that took place essentially laid the grounds for the more aggressive corporate influences that followed.

By the early 1970s, the expansion phase of universities in Canada came to an end. A confluence of forces combined to transform the conventional wisdom about higher education. These included shrinking employment opportunities for university graduates; the fiscal crisis of the state that called into question the legitimacy of generous public funding; and an ideological shift premised on the inefficiencies of the public sector, universal programs (including universal accessibility) and comprehensive curriculums. At the same time, liberal arts education was partly decoupled from its economic rationale as business began to focus on targeted funding and more specialized programming. By the end of the decade, per capita education spending had fallen significantly in all provinces and universities started to transform their operations in an effort to cope with these losses. The choices made by universities and governments in response to these changes – along with the emergence of more direct and active corporate involvement in

higher education – would precipitate a new era of economic rationality, “accountability” and market-based restructuring; in short, the corporatization of Canadian universities.

Long-time critic of the corporate university, David Noble (2007: 6), summarizes the far-reaching impact of the transformation. Corporatization, says Noble,

left chaos in its wake ... class sizes swelled, academic programs were cut and ‘restructured,’ course offerings were reduced, tuition and fees were substantially increased while student financial support was slashed, staff salaries were frozen, faculty hirings and tenure tracks were minimized and full-time faculty were increasingly replaced by cheaper contract instructors and graduate students ... a new emphasis on non-disclosure, confidentiality and secrecy subverted open and free intellectual interchange, and intensified the suppression of dissent ... the selfless pursuit of contributions to human knowledge gave way to proprietary and pecuniary interest as the mark and measure of academic achievement, fatally eroding the integrity of the institution as a unique and invaluable repository of disinterested expertise. Censorship, heightened competition, delays in publication, scientific fraud and theft, greed, corruption, conflict of interest, and commercial litigation became the hallmarks of the new university, as the ethos of academia came ever more to resemble that of the so-called private sector which administrators strove so hard to emulate.

In the remaining chapters, I describe and analyze the corporatization process in detail.

Chapter Three: Perspectives on Academic Capitalism and the Causes of University Restructuring

In 2011, China's Tsinghua University named one of its lecture halls after a popular brand of jeans. The large gold letters of the "Jeanswest Building" outraged many students, who denounced the greed of the administration and defaced the new sign. China's Education Ministry also rebuked the university and suggested it find a more suitable way to express its gratitude for corporate patronage. The nameplate was subsequently removed (Moore 2011). In contrast, corporate sponsorship on Canadian campuses has become so commonplace that few would notice a newly branded building. According to a recent survey, the "commercial and corporate presence" in Canadian universities has been "normalized as part of campus culture" (CCPA 2008: 2). This increasing "commercial and corporate presence" takes many forms. Several years ago, for example, administrators at York University solicited companies to place their logos on university-sponsored online courses (for ten thousand dollars per course). More recently, universities have been using private equity firms to construct condominium-style campus residences (Ladurantaye 2010; Peters 2013). One of the most consistently observed commercial shifts has been the practice of contracting out campus services to private firms, especially in the area of food services. In return for cash, universities grant exclusive licenses to food providers – often fast-food and soft drink chains – allowing them effective monopolies over the campus cuisine market. These kinds of contracts have come under scrutiny because, in some cases, they tie the university's income to the sale

of a specified amount of the product,³³ and/or the details are negotiated in secret, which excludes students and other campus employees.³⁴

These direct manifestations of corporate influence are obvious indicators of corporatization. Behind these more obvious signs, however, a more insidious process is taking place through the corporatization of the academy, which involves an institutional transformation of teaching, learning, research, governance and academic culture. In this chapter, I review and analyze the key theoretical perspectives on the corporatization process, beginning with an analysis of what academic capitalism, as a concept and process, means. In the analysis that follows, I identify the internal and external causes of corporatization and the influences associated with this transformation at the global level.

Corporatization and Academic Capitalism

While the public interest commitment of Canadian universities was relatively strong in the 1960s, represented by the importance placed on institutional autonomy, collegial governance and academic freedom, this commitment has been steadily eroding. Both supporters and critics of corporatization acknowledge that the seminal values that traditionally framed the role of the public university are changing. Others go further, arguing that the mixing of commercial objectives with academic norms and values has evolved from the irregular to the customary state of affairs. There are many consequences

³³ One agreement between Coca-Cola and the Université du Québec à Montréal, for instance, included a clause stipulating that coke consumption must increase by 130 percent over ten years; if sales did not comply, the company would be given a free two-year contract extension (CCPA 2005). Lucrative corporate contracts and the lack of priority afforded to public infrastructure also means that many new university buildings are no longer required to install public drinking fountains.

³⁴ Perhaps the most notable example of such secrecy clauses is the case of Canadian universities and US-based food giant Aramark, where there have been difficulties gaining public access to contracts and challenges around the company's services and labour practices (Arsenault 2007).

of this institutional transformation. University presidents have been recast as “CEOs,” students as “customers,” graduates as “products” and professors as “service providers.” Contractual business relationships and measures of fiscal viability have been elevated in relation to social commitments. Profit has become a leading goal of academic inquiry and a guiding principal for deciding what products and services to offer. Decisions about course offerings, research funding, and hiring and enrollment practices are assessed less in terms of academic criteria and more on whether they represent good business decisions.

Increasingly, then, university education is regarded as a private rather than a public good, where higher learning is viewed less as a right of citizenship and more as a purchasable commodity. Under corporatization, the public interest – once defined as shielding public entities from the market – is assumed to be enhanced by embracing commercial activities. From an institutional standpoint, serving the needs of the global economy and preparing young people for corporate employment has become the university’s primary mission. As Stanley Aronowitz (2000: 81) observes, “[w]hat was once the hidden curriculum – the subordination of higher education to the needs of capital – has become an open, frank policy ... today leaders of higher education wear the badge of corporate servants proudly.”

In academic scholarship, a variety of theoretical frameworks have been advanced to explain and critique the corporatization process. A common practice within this literature has been to theorize the emergence of a “new” type of university that more closely resembles corporations and is more heavily integrated with the market. Appendix A includes brief descriptions of these institutional configurations. Arguably, the leading

theoretical models on university restructuring revolve around the concept of “academic capitalism.” In what follows, I engage with this seminal concept in order to highlight some of the key features of corporatization as well as to explain how the forces of university restructuring operate both inside and outside of the academy.

While commonly attributed to the work of Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997) and Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2004), the term “academic capitalism” was actually coined several decades ago by Robert Nisbet (1971). In his work, Nisbet claimed that the billions of dollars made available to American universities after World War Two (much of it from private sources) had an immediate and profound impact on the academy. “For the first time in Western history,” he writes, “professors and scholars were thrust into the unwonted position of entrepreneurs in incessant search” of capital, revenue and profit (p. 73). “Whereas for centuries the forces of commerce, trade, and industrialization outside the university” had little impact upon the academic community, a new force – “academic capitalism” – was transforming scholarship and the role of the professoriate.³⁵ According to Nisbet, the introduction of new financing models also had a deep impact on university governance. Managers were hired not because they were respected members of the academic community but because they had administrative ability, which Nisbet defined as skill in attracting external revenues and sensitivity to the “problems of finance, production, marketing, and especially salesmanship” (pp. 76-77).

³⁵ Nisbet (1971) explains that much of the new money was earmarked for the purposes of establishing research institutes, bureaus and other essentially “capitalist” enterprises within American universities. This shift gave external resource providers more control over university operations and increased the entrepreneurial orientation of professors. In contrast, the research institutes and programs developed in Canada in the post-war period were usually organized, funded and controlled by universities themselves. This is one reason why entrepreneurship did not characterize university expansion in Canada to the same extent as it did in the US.

Like Nisbet, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) conceptualize academic capitalism as the encroachment of the profit motive into the academy; however, they highlight different reasons to explain this change. Drawing on case studies in Canada, the US, Australia and Britain, the authors argue that government spending cuts in the 1980s and 1990s compelled universities and researchers to engage in additional market activities. These activities included direct, for-profit ventures, such as patenting, licensing and the formation of spin-off companies, but also “marketlike behaviours” in the form of enhanced competition for external research grants, increasing student fees and aggressively seeking corporate donations. At the same time, industrial research collaborations and high technology programs were prioritized over traditional academic programs and practices. According to Slaughter and Leslie, this new entrepreneurial environment altered the purposes, reward systems and decision-making structures of higher education, so much so that the centre of the academy “shifted from a liberal arts core to an entrepreneurial periphery” (p. 207).

Slaughter and Leslie’s (1997) work focuses on research funding and commercialization as the key components of academic capitalism. Looking specifically at the US, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) move beyond this focus to construct a broader vision of academic capitalism where market forces are ingrained in all facets of university life.³⁶ The authors conceptualize higher education as shifting from a “public good knowledge/learning regime” to an ascendant “academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime” (p. 28). This latter regime is characterized by “new circuits

³⁶ Theories of academic capitalism have since been taken up by scholars in other countries to analyze changes in national higher education systems (e.g., for Latin America, see Rhoades et al. 2004; for Japan, see Chan-Tiberghien 2010).

of knowledge” where corporations and university administrators play a more prominent role in the creation and transmission of knowledge emanating from the university (e.g., through intellectual property agreements and distance education centres). Under this regime, knowledge is redefined as a private good and the principal goal of knowledge production is the creation of high-technology products for the global marketplace. The new regime is also typified by shifting boundaries between public and private space. New networks of actors and structures mediate and blur the boundaries between universities, the state and corporate world (e.g., offices of technology transfer and the Canadian Foundation for Innovation).

In addition to differences in how these two pieces of work constitute academic capitalism, they also differ in their treatment of the extent to which a capitalist or corporate model has influenced the university. Whereas Slaughter and Leslie (1997) draw attention to the introduction of the profit motive into the academy, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) go further by showing how profit-oriented activities have become internally embedded. For example, many universities have developed an expanded institutional capacity to commercialize research products outside of traditional academic structures. This is evidenced in Canada by growing university involvement in patenting and licensing activities. Moreover, academic units that are “closer to the market” are more and more likely to be prioritized within the institutional hierarchy. In Canada, one can see this trend taking shape through a decrease in funding for the social sciences and humanities and an increase in support for professional and applied programs. In the areas of teaching and learning, greater emphasis is placed on the marketing of educational services while fewer resources are devoted to undergraduate instruction. As a

consequence, contract faculty have been taking on much of the teaching responsibilities once performed by tenure stream faculty in Canada and elsewhere.

Academic Capitalism in the Canadian Context

When did Canada's transition to academic capitalism begin and how did it compare to university restructuring elsewhere? Like their counterparts in the US, the UK and Australia, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that Canadian universities began to turn to academic capitalism in the 1980s and 1990s. In Canada, this shift was marked by the growing preference for curricula with market relevance, an increase in applied and entrepreneurial research, and greater reliance on tuition fees and other sources of private funding. It was also facilitated by corporate lobbying and government policies that encouraged commercial research and development, vocational programs and a more competitive institutional environment. Nonetheless, Slaughter and Leslie point out that Canadian universities succumbed to market pressures somewhat later than other countries and that they underwent a lesser degree of structural reform. The reasons behind this difference include the fact that Canada has a less centralized system of higher education, which means it is more difficult to bring about rapid, systemic change. Moreover, in Canada, there was stronger state support for core university operations and a strong, decentralized unionization of the faculties, which insulated Canadian universities from market forces.

Slaughter and Leslie's (1997) observation that Canada was an exception to the trend toward academic capitalism was, in some ways, inaccurate. As noted in the opening chapter, Canadian scholarship (e.g., Buchbinder and Newson 1990; Newson and Buchbinder 1988) as well as evidence from business sources (e.g., Ohlendorf 1985)

suggests that corporatization and academic capitalism had taken root by the middle of the 1980s. Furthermore, Slaughter and Leslie acknowledge that their analysis was limited by a lack of data on Canadian higher education (e.g., data on post-secondary revenues and expenditures in the 1990s), something that continues to plague national research efforts. Writing in the *Journal of Higher Education*, Amy Scott Metcalfe (2010) revisits Slaughter and Leslie's claims. Drawing on more recent data, Metcalfe asserts that "Canada is certainly no longer, and perhaps never was, the 'exception' to academic capitalism as Slaughter and Leslie had suggested" (p. 490). In any event, according to Metcalfe, Canada has since moved "swiftly into the realm of academic capitalism," erasing any notion of Canadian exceptionalism (p. 503). As I will demonstrate in the chapters to come, the updated model of academic capitalism put forward by Slaughter and Rhoads – where market forces permeate all facets of academic life – has come to characterize many Canadian universities today.

Forces of Restructuring: Inside-Out or Outside-In?

Most scholars and policy-makers agree that a new market-based vision for university education has taken shape in recent years. There is also general agreement concerning the direction and priorities of higher educational policy in Canada and elsewhere.

Nevertheless, there is considerable disagreement around the *sources* of this restructuring; that is, whether the determinants of change are largely located inside or outside of the university.

Inside-Out: Academic Capitalism and the New Corporate Ethos

Some scholars attribute the recent changes in higher education to internal factors, such as the modern university's "lack of purpose." For proponents of this perspective, the view is that the university's role in modern society is no longer clearly defined; they have lost sight of any clear mission beyond a general commitment to "excellence" and are operating in a policy vacuum that is easily exploited by outside interests (e.g., Aronowitz 2000; Readings 1996). Theorists in the area of academic capitalism also cite internal factors, but they argue that restructuring is largely an expression of the autonomous initiatives and commitments of academic actors. Put another way, the logic of the private marketplace has shaped the consciousness and practices of professors and administrative professionals so that they pursue the commercial potential of academic and nonacademic products and support the restructuring of institutions in the corporate image. In the area of intellectual property in particular, these writers point out that university personnel have become far more aggressive in pursuing the material benefits of knowledge production.

To provide additional context for this perspective, I will review some of the more noteworthy sources in this area. To start, Nisbet (1971), in his reading of academic capitalism, claims that US academics provided strong support for the rise of entrepreneurialism within the university. In his view, the reorganization of the university was "the direct result of academic choice: or, putting it concretely, of individual choices by large numbers of faculty members in the period following the war for this selfsame conversion and transformation ... No one could have been more surprised than [corporate leaders] at the eagerness, the rapacity" with which professors coveted outside dollars and commercial prestige (p. 82). First in the natural sciences, and later in the social sciences

and humanities, the academy was “bestridden by that modern incarnation of Caesar, the academic capitalist, the professorial entrepreneur, the new man of power!” (p. 75). In *The Closed Corporation* (1968), James Ridgeway makes a similar argument. Through his research, Ridgeway documents how academic entrepreneurs altered the character of US universities by establishing their own companies and by facilitating commercial ties between universities and corporations: “As power brokers,” he writes, these professors “act with one hand in the university and the other in a big corporation; they move in and out, using their prestige as scholars to advance the interests of the company; or on the other hand, using their influence with the company to help the university get research funds.” According to Ridgeway, by the late 1960s, the university had been reduced to serving as “banker-broker” for professors’ outside interests (pp. 84, 215).

Turning to the more recent period, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) provide a slightly more nuanced position of the role academics play in shaping the direction of higher education in relation to market influences. They note the contradictory position that professors and academic managers find themselves in within the context of corporatization. Operating in a competitive market environment, these workers are employed by the public sector but are increasingly autonomous from it; they “act as capitalists from within the public sector; they are state-subsidized entrepreneurs” (p. 9). In other words, academic capitalists are actively engaged with the market at the same time as they are cushioned by public money and institutional resources (much like their counterparts in other state-supported industries). In the 1990s, then, Slaughter and Leslie viewed academic entrepreneurship as a reaction to external pressures and resource dependency, where individuals were “pushed” and “pulled” in particular directions by

corporations and other resource providers (p. 211). Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) later challenged this assumption by asserting that the academy should no longer be considered a passive entity that is acted upon by external forces. To support this assertion, they point to the active, sometimes leading, role that professors and administrators play in corporatizing higher education.³⁷ In their words, these individuals are “actors initiating academic capitalism, not just players being ‘corporatized’” (p. 12). More recent work supports this claim and suggests that graduate students have also become more active in market activities, including entrepreneurship.³⁸

That corporatization operates from the “inside-out” is supported by a recent survey of Canadian university vice-presidents (Crocker and Usher 2006). Respondents were asked about the culture and practice of “innovation” – defined as the competition for external dollars, knowledge transfer and the promotion of commercial research opportunities – at their institutions. Overwhelmingly, those administrators who considered their innovation climates to be positive maintained that its key drivers came from within. Very few believed that innovation on their campuses was driven by external forces. This finding was especially true for schools with a preponderance of younger faculty members, which speaks to the growing generational divide with respect to the culture and expectations of university research.

³⁷ It should be noted that these same arguments are present in Burton Clarke’s (1998) work on the “entrepreneurial university” (see Figure 1). In several of his institutional case studies, Clarke found that while external forces may have initiated the drive towards corporatization, a proactive entrepreneurial culture soon emerged that expedited restructuring efforts.

³⁸ For example, Mars, Slaughter and Rhoades (2008) argue that graduate students are now utilizing the entrepreneurial environments of their universities – especially in the fields of science and technology – to produce marketable products and services. The position of student as entrepreneur challenges Slaughter and Rhoades’ (2004) contention that students are mainly passive victims of academic capitalism. The fact that student entrepreneurship has emerged as a sponsored university activity underscores the extent to which an entrepreneurial culture has permeated higher education.

Based on these data, it would appear that many universities have become willing co-capitalists, with some enthusiastically embracing market values. But why have so many academics and academic managers assumed this role? Is it simply that they “sold out” to corporate interests, or that they reacted to funding shortfalls in the only way possible? To be sure, these explanations hold some merit. For example, the growing division between commercial and non-commercial research has allowed academic entrepreneurs to acquire a greater and greater share of available resources. This means, in practical terms, that many have a vested interest in corporatization. And in a more competitive educational environment, academic workers are understandably more aware of and concerned about their own security (and that of their institutions). For this reason, entrepreneurialism is often viewed as both an individual and an institutional necessity.

At the same time, some of the reasons why academics have assumed this role are more complex. For one, the context of academic work is highly competitive, both in the appointment, tenure and promotion processes, as well as the ways in which research and research reward structures are tied to the production of an academy hierarchy. Academic work is also often highly individualistic. Intellectuals tend to view themselves, at least in part, as independent entrepreneurs who enjoy considerable autonomy and control over their labour. As a result, they have a social identity and a set of working conditions similar to that of “semi-autonomous craft workers” (Tudiver 1999: 161). As Mike Burke and Joanne Naiman (2003) explain, the entrepreneurial identity linked to the semi-autonomous nature of academic work can and has been exploited by those who want to encourage competitiveness among faculty. The strong emphasis on competition and private procurement under corporatization twists the professoriate’s entrepreneurial

orientation (centred on independent scholarship) into one based more on profit-making and performance-based rewards. Indeed, the idea of independent scholarship today often serves as a mask for commercial activities.

However, to fully appreciate the new entrepreneurial culture, I would argue that we also need to recognize that academic capitalism has become part of a new set of values within the university context. Polster (2010: 15) refers to this change as “the progressive normalization of a corporate ethos within Canadian universities.” In this way, a new “common sense” has emerged whereby corporate values and practices are taken for granted as the only legitimate way to function within a university setting. Elsewhere, Polster (2007a: 615-616) likens this ethos to a creeping “instrumentalism,” or the incorporation of instrumental rationality into all aspects of university life. In her words:

Canadian universities and those within them are becoming ever more frantic and calculating as they seek new opportunities and ‘edges’ that allow them to maintain and advance their positions in an increasingly insecure and unstable environment. And from institutions where the intrinsic worth of ideas, values, and people was recognized and respected, Canada’s universities are becoming places where worth is progressively determined in relation to financial costs and benefits, at the expense of people’s dignity, integrity, solidarity, and security.

What Polster is referring to here implies that a deeper process is at work than simply the replacement of public values with private ones. Within the academy, altruism and public service are becoming synonymous with market engagement and increasingly mediated by the university’s service to the economy.³⁹ Likewise, conceptions of the public good are

³⁹ Some universities make their “service” commitments explicit. For example, the University of Western Ontario has established itself as an organization offering multiple services to the business community. Ted Hewitt, Vice-President of Research and International Relations, says that Western “is open to establishing strong relationships with companies, near and far, large and small ... If we can help you, we are with you from A to Z, as our ‘customers’ are going to be our best clients to help the economy grow and move forward” (Ontario Chamber of Commerce 2010: 8).

becoming aligned with individualism and private gain, as opposed to traditional notions of collective benefits for society as a whole.

Over a half century ago, Clark Kerr wrote about the similarities between the business and the academic entrepreneur. As he put it, “the individual faculty member is a genuine entrepreneur ... Freedom for the academician in the university serves a public purpose just as does freedom for the entrepreneur in his marketplace – and it is the same purpose: the quality and progress of society. Out of the free action of each the public gets the best product as business competes with business and mind with mind” (cited in Soo and Carson 2004: 222). Within the context of corporatization, Kerr’s analogy takes on new meaning. The ways in which these corporate and academic entrepreneurs ostensibly serve the “quality and progress of society” have become more closely aligned. The freedom to maximize material wealth on the part of the business entrepreneur is similar to the notion of “freedom” championed by today’s academic entrepreneur. And for many academic capitalists it is entrepreneurial freedom – not academic freedom – that is taking precedence. These individuals are not abandoning their public commitments so much as they are redefining their means according to market logic.

As the previous discussion makes clear, there is merit to looking at the ways in which those on the inside are supporting the corporatization of the university. These insiders include academic entrepreneurs and their quest for private gain, as well as a growing number of administrators who have adopted corporate management models in their institutions. In contrast, other forces of educational restructuring originate and operate outside the university. It is to a discussion of these “outside-in” forces that we now turn.

Outside-In: Globalization, Neoliberalism and the Corporate Offensive

Contrary to those who emphasize internal factors, many analysts argue that the main sources of educational reform are external to the university, particularly the pressures associated with economic globalization. According to this dominant globalization discourse, the nature of a nation's higher educational institutions has become a marker of its competitive position in the global economy, and of its capacity to attract and retain both a skilled workforce and corporate investment. The focus here is on the importance of higher education to economic growth, science and technology and (often vague) conceptions of innovation and prosperity. From this standpoint, policy makers at the level of the nation state look to global market pressures to inform decision-making. Universities, in turn, have modified their managerial practices and institutional arrangements to be consistent with changing policy priorities.

Proponents of this perspective see the practice of linking universities with the corporate sector to enhance national economic competitiveness as crucial to drawing universities into the process of globalization. Among these proponents, however, there is debate about who or what is responsible for this shift and its key consequences. The political right tends to view the changes associated with globalization as resulting from impersonal market forces. Educational restructuring is seen as a rational and necessary response to the inevitabilities of a changing market, and the process of corporatization is presented in technocratic rather than political or ideological terms (see Sears 2003). In contrast, those coming from a left political view locate educational restructuring within the wider political or "neoliberal" context of globalization. Neoliberalism, they contend, is a carefully crafted political project involving broad economic and political

transformations. And a key part of this project has involved changing the function of universities from institutions that serve the public good to those that provide a more profitable ground for capitalist expansion.

There is significant evidence to support this contention that outside influences, ushered by agents of neoliberalism, have played a key role in shaping educational reform in Canada and elsewhere. Neoliberal restructuring in the area of higher education began in conjunction with the well-recognized “corporate offensive” that accelerated throughout the developed capitalist world in the early-mid 1970s (Brownlee 2005). During this period, falling profits and stagnating economic growth led corporate leaders to mobilize their collective resources to increase their power and control over the global economic system. For one, the offensive was a response to the widespread political upheaval of the 1960s, when marginalized groups, such as workers, women and ethnic minorities, began to organize, with universities being a key site of “subversive” activities and student radicalism. Elites in the Trilateral Commission viewed the prospect of normally passive and marginalized sectors of the population organizing themselves into the political arena as a “crisis of democracy” (see Crozier, Huntington and Watanuki 1975). In part, they saw this “crisis” as resulting from a failure on the part of schools and universities, or those institutions responsible for “the indoctrination of the young” (p. 162). They also pointed to the threat of “value-oriented intellectuals,” who devoted themselves to “the derogation of leadership, the challenging of authority, and the unmasking and delegitimation of established institutions” (p. 7). Similar concerns were expressed by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Commission argued that the culture of the university was undermining the legitimacy of the capitalist system by increasing

expectations among the general population – expectations of meaningful work, a decent standard of living and political participation.⁴⁰

As part of business efforts to respond to these activities and weaken the academic left, US Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell (1971) developed a comprehensive political strategy for the US business community in the 1970s. His strategy was based around a program of cultural reform that called for the insertion of conservative ideas and values into all aspects of American society, including universities. This program involved monitoring textbooks, curriculums and campus lectures; financing the work of conservative intellectuals via think-tanks and foundations; lobbying boards of trustees; and establishing a new conservative network of university academics (see Messer 1993; Schrecker 2010). While initiated in the US, this kind of general campaign also extended to Canada in the 1980s and was led by a new network of conservative speakers and writers. They launched a multifaceted campaign to protest against courses and programs devoted to race, gender and class inequality – representing the so-called politicization or “anti-intellectualism” of the curriculum – and to portray academics as hostile to Western values and interests.⁴¹ These attacks succeeded in not only shifting intellectual discourse to the right, but in opening up political space for corporatization.

⁴⁰ In its Final Report in 1973, the Carnegie Commission stated that professors and students were “disrupting” society by operating outside of normally prescribed democratic channels. In their words, campus activism in the 1960s went “far beyond the historic limits of dissent” as faculties took “institutionalized positions on political issues of an off-campus nature and abandoned the traditional position of political neutrality by the institution” (p. 25).

⁴¹ In the US, see Bennett 1984, Bloom 1987, D’Souza 1991, Kimball 1990, Horowitz 2006, Horowitz and Laksin 2009 and Shapiro 2004. In Canada, the backlash against “political correctness” and democracy in the university can be found in works such as John Fekete’s *Moral Panic* (1994), as well as David Bercuson, Robert Bothwell and J.L. Granatstein’s *The Great Brain Robbery* (1984) and *Petrified Campus* (1997). Self-described “intellectual elitists,” Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein (1997: 5) have openly called for less democracy in university governance, less faculty unionism, less student participation in academic decision-making, the elimination of tenure, large increases in tuition fees, and the elimination of courses and programs they deem “useless” or overtly political.

Also as part of the neoliberal corporate offensive, the university was portrayed as an institution that is unresponsive to market demands and where a great deal of “useless” learning takes place. The university’s supposed inefficiencies placed it alongside other “failing” public programs and entitlements, such as healthcare and social security.⁴² In this way, higher education became a target of corporate/political efforts to change the culture of the public sphere, and to facilitate a technologically-facilitated shift in power and accountability (Franklin 2000). As David Noble (2001: 27) explains,

corporate and political leaders of the major industrialized countries of the world recognized that they were losing their monopoly over the world’s heavy industries and that, in the future, their supremacy would depend upon their monopoly over the knowledge that had become the lifeblood of the new so-called knowledge-based industries (space, electronics, computers, materials, telecommunications, and bioengineering). This focus upon ‘intellectual capital’ turned their attention to the universities as its chief source, implicating the universities as never before in the economic machinery. In the view of capital, the universities had become too important to be left to the universities.

To respond to these concerns and assert greater control over higher education, business leaders (with the help of corporate-oriented think tanks and policy organizations) propagated an ideology that defined the university as merely another business organization. The emphasis was on bringing universities to focus more on technical innovation, marketable skills and, at a broader level, to serving social and economic “needs” as defined by these same leaders. According to Clyde Barrow (1990: 253), this hegemonic ideology “clearly originated with a corporate elite that has successfully forged a long-term educational coalition with other political, bureaucratic, and administrative

⁴² While this may be the position of many corporate and political leaders, public opinion surveys reveal that universities (and academics) enjoy a strong level of support and trust among the general population, both in terms of how the institutions are managed and in the belief that public funding to universities should be substantially increased (e.g., CAUT 2009b; Ekos Research Associates 2005).

officials, who remain its chief proponents.” As a result of these campaigns, Barrow says, we have witnessed the “institutionalization of a corporate ideal within the university.”

The specific goals of Canadian business leaders were consistent with the larger project that both Noble (2001) and Barrow (1990) describe. In the 1980s and 1990s, the Business Council on National Issues (BCNI), now the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, played a lead role in articulating and advancing an elite consensus on educational issues.⁴³ In the area of higher education, the Council called for public-private research partnerships, vocational training and increasing the share of private funding to universities (e.g., BCNI 1993). During this period, the Corporate-Higher Education Forum (CHEF) – an alliance of 25 CEOs of major corporations and 25 university presidents – acted as chief spokesperson for the BCNI on issues of university reform. Many other organizations were also on board with the corporate agenda, including the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers’ Association, the National Council on Education, the Canadian Association of University Business Officers, the Fraser and C.D. Howe Institutes and the Conference Board of Canada. The power and consensus-building capacity of this alliance helps to explain why early restructuring efforts had near unanimous (if tacit) support from most sectors. As Norman Bowie (1994: 42) explains, the initial expansion of university-business partnerships in Canada “had solid support from all the affected constituencies – government officials, business executives, and university faculty and administrators,” which meant that it was rarely

⁴³ For a discussion of how corporate capitalists in the early 1980s exhibited a high level of class consciousness around educational issues and a high degree of coherence and consistency in their views on educational reform, see D.W. Livingstone (1985).

called into question.⁴⁴ Of course, the public, arguably the most important affected constituency, was not included in this analysis.⁴⁵

At the First National Conference on Business-Education Partnerships in 1990 – organized in association with the Conference Board of Canada – corporate leaders were explicit about the way they understood the relationship between universities and the business community and identified future ways to capitalize on this relationship (Bloom 1990). At the conference, Norman Kissick, CEO of Union Carbide Canada, stressed the need for a “permanent commitment by business and education leaders to develop a closer partnership,” and added that “excellence must be chosen over breadth of curricula” so that students could be trained to “create, produce and market high-technology, value-added products” for the corporate economy (p. 6). Similarly, Vice-President of IBM Canada, Anita Ross, argued that the entire educational system required “radical change” to shift it to an economic rather than a social enterprise (p. 13). This position was also reflected in the perspectives advanced by some university administrators. For example, the President of the University of New Brunswick, James Downey, stated that educational reform should encourage “competition that promotes greater relevance and quality” and acknowledged the ability of American business leaders to transfer “the organizational, management and free market strategies that have proved successful in business” to schools (p. 5).

⁴⁴ As Ralph Nader has pointed out with respect to the US, the emergence of corporatization “hardly disturbed the leisure of the ‘theory class’ on campus” (cited in Krinsky 2003: ix). The same was true of Canada, at least in the early years. In fact, many Canadian academics were highly supportive of the changes. A Science Council of Canada survey on the matter found that 46 percent of university respondents (versus 60 percent from industry) reported favouring the “acceleration” of corporate-university ties (Newson and Buchbinder 1988).

⁴⁵ Opinion polls in the 1980s, for example, indicated widespread public support for increased public spending on post-secondary education, contrary to the decisions made and supported by political and corporate leaders (see, for example, Michael and Holdaway 1992).

The consequences of this growing elite consensus were almost immediate. For example, writing in *Report on Business Magazine*, Pat Ohlendorf (1985) documented the “astonishing number of companies” that turned to universities for leading-edge technology and commercial product development in the 1980s. University-corporate linkages, according to Ohlendorf, increased at an unprecedented rate in Canada and surpassed that of any other country outside of the US. Universities welcomed the infusion of new monies after a “decade of crippling budget cuts,” while the goal of Canadian corporations was simple: “hitting the jackpot” (Ohlendorf 1985). These consequences are, of course, still evident today. John Valleau and Paul Hamel (2010: 57), two scientists at the University of Toronto, argue that Canada remains entrenched in a “highly orchestrated campaign by financial and industrial interests, in co-operation with our governments, to shift university activity away from scholarship toward bolstering the economic and social status quo and especially to assisting Canadian industries to increase short-term profits.”

While the extent to which corporate Canada’s involvement in university affairs has been entirely deliberate or represents a convergence of mutual interests is open to debate, university restructuring needs to be understood within its wider political and economic context. The fact that universities tend to reflect the impact of broader social forces is nothing new. As discussed in the last chapter, universities have always been a product of their social milieu and closely linked to larger external sources of power. It follows that there will be inherent challenges in trying to develop free and democratic universities in a society characterized by inequality. These limitations have been recognized by Paulo Freire, who claims that it is “naïve idealism” to believe that a “province on freedom” can

be created within the university when “the material conditions of [the broader] society work against the affirmation of freedom” (cited in Freire et al 1994); as well as by Canadian student “syndicalists,” who argued in the 1960s that the problems of education were rooted in socio-economic structures and that their solution entailed altering these structures in the direction of a more equitable society.

To summarize the perspectives reviewed to this point, university restructuring has been shaped by forces inside and outside of the university, with corporatization being a two-way process involving many different agents and institutional actors. On the one hand, some internal features of university life – including commercial preoccupations, heightened competition and reduced collegial governance – have supported the introduction of market methods and values. Interestingly, those who advance this perspective highlight that institutional change should not be seen as an inevitable adaptation to external pressures, as it masks how the university community is implicated in the very political and economic forces to which it “must” then accommodate.⁴⁶ At the same time, many point to the important role that external forces have played in reshaping higher education. Some of these forces operate primarily at the national level, including organized business campaigns to draw universities into the corporatization process, and government policies to redefine universities as knowledge centers for marketable skills. Perhaps the most pivotal external factor in shaping educational restructuring – manifested at the level of the nation state but impacted by global forces – was the sharp and

⁴⁶ According to Roszak (1968: 26), the fact that material temptations are offered does not excuse the acceptance of them. He writes: “[i]t would be pathetic indeed if those who have given themselves to the life of the mind were to plead that they were powerless to reform their own professional environment ... But the plea becomes outrageous when the forces to which men (sic) surrender exert their greatest power, not by terror or repression, but by offering the bribes of prestige and comfort.”

prolonged reduction in public funding that began in the 1970s. Given the importance of this particular historical trend in understanding the corporatization of universities in Canada, this factor is explored in detail in the following section.

Outside In: Specific Concerns of Retrenchment and Austerity

In the educational sphere and elsewhere, there are important linkages between public funding and process of corporatization. The logic is simple: once underfunding has undermined the integrity and functionality of a public system, corporations can arrive and reinvigorate the “failing” institutions through restructuring or privatization. In some cases, these motivations have been articulated quite clearly by political and other leaders. In 1995, for example, Conservative Education Minister of Ontario, John Snobelen, remarked: “If we really want to fundamentally change the issue in training and ... education we’ll have to first make sure we’ve communicated brilliantly the breakdown in the process we currently experience. That’s not easy. We need to invent a crisis. That’s not just an act of courage. There’s some skill involved” (cited in Sears 2003: 4). In the case of higher education in Canada, such a process began in the 1970s with two, interrelated objectives: (i) convince people that the system is “broken,” and (ii) ensure that it *is* broken through fiscal austerity. Many have studied the external role of underfunding in facilitating market-based restructuring in Canada, showing how a pattern of reduced government expenditures for higher education ostensibly propelled Canadian universities from the so-called “golden age” into the era of corporatization. The purpose of this section is to review these historical developments and some of their consequences.

There have been a series of key events and decisions that have shaped the educational restructuring process in Canada. At the federal level, a key policy change was

the creation of Established Programs Financing (EPF) in 1977. The EPF replaced the 50/50 cost-sharing program with the provinces – where federal contributions were matched dollar for dollar by provincial contributions – with a new funding arrangement based on tax points and cash transfers. Another feature of this new formula was that provinces were no longer accountable for how federal contributions would be spent, so there was no guarantee that federal funds for post-secondary education would be allocated to universities and colleges. From the late 1970s to the early 1990s, Liberal and Conservative governments reduced the monetary commitment to post-secondary education through repeated amendments to this funding formula; the billions of dollars cut by the Conservatives under Prime Minister Mulroney was especially noteworthy. Overall, between 1983-84 and 1994-95 the federal contribution to post-secondary education was reduced by nearly \$13.5 billion (Tudiver 1999).

Partly a result of changes at the federal level, every province imposed funding cuts to universities in the 1970s, with different provinces reducing expenditures at different times. Many eastern universities, for example, experienced retrenchment in the early-mid 1970s, whereas changes in Alberta and British Columbia took place several years later (Newson and Buchbinder 1988). From 1976-77 to 1986-87, provincial grants in constant dollars per full-time student were reduced by an average of more than 20 percent nationwide. Tudiver (1999) describes the impact of these changes on the climate of universities as “chaos” (p. 71).

Universities eliminated frills, held back on salary increases, suspended hiring, replaced full-time faculty with limited-term and part-time appointees, laid off support staff, cut back on library operations and acquisitions, put off maintenance of buildings and equipment, and sought greater efficiencies wherever possible in the use of people, plant, and equipment. Short of major

surgery to academic programs, universities did everything feasible to stay the course in the most trying fiscal setback since the Great Depression (p. 81).

Tudiver also notes that austerity led to governance conflicts between academic and corporate models, where “(r)elations between faculty and administrators started to resemble worker-manager conflict in industry” (p 78). Administrators were seemingly operating in a “Hobbesian environment” of recurrent budget crises, where they made decisions to cut budgets and control costs in line with a corporate management approach (Steck 2003: 69). A survey of Canadian academic vice-presidents and deans in 1991 reflects that this shift in perspective persisted.⁴⁷

From the mid-1970s through the 1980s, the proportion of Canadian university revenues drawn from private donations and non-governmental grants nearly doubled (Cameron 1991). The austerity programs over this period, and the resulting impacts nationally and at the provincial level, reflected resource scarcity on the part of governments to some extent, but they also reflected a deliberate plan to link universities more closely with the market and to lay the foundation for corporatization.⁴⁸ The desire, on the part of social leaders, to facilitate this shift was evident in the work of the Task Force on Labour Market Development, headed by economist David Dodge (1981). The Task Force suggested a number of concrete ways that universities could be “induced” into a restructuring mandate. These included more reliance on private funding, redirecting federal funds to support sponsored research, market-based programs and

⁴⁷ The survey found that underfunding was perceived to be the most important external influence compelling university reform (Small 1994). Although respondents were generally supportive of the restructuring agenda, many reported that underfunding forced them to make changes that were detrimental to their institutions.

⁴⁸ Writing about this period, Gordon Shrimpton (1987: 196) argued that universities were being drawn into “devil’s agreements” by fiscal desperation and risking their “cornerstone principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy” in the pursuit of new money.

skills-based training, and reallocating money away from arts-based disciplines. This series of recommendations implied that basic funding for core university operations and liberal arts education was a lesser priority, and that there needed to be a stronger focus on forging university-business partnerships.⁴⁹ As noted above, other key actors, including the BCNI and the CHEF also played leading roles in articulating an elite consensus on educational issues during this period. The BCNI launched a sustained assault to undermine public confidence in public education and called for government cutbacks to universities, while the CHEF advocated government underfunding to make universities more responsive to private interests (Barlow and Robertson 1994).⁵⁰

Retrenchment continued in the 1990s. In 1995, the federal Liberals brought the EPF and the Canada Assistance Plan together under a single financing mechanism: the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST). The CHST further reduced federal transfers to the provinces and gave them more discretion over how funds were to be divided among health care, education and other social programs. As a result, the proportion of the federal transfer going to post-secondary education was reduced. The percentage of university operating income paid for by students, which had been increasing since the early 1980s, accelerated from 24.3 percent in 1994-95 to 31.6 percent just three years later. Over the

⁴⁹ A second parliamentary task force, *Work for Tomorrow: Employment Opportunities for the 1980s*, supported this vision (Allmand 1981). The task force took the position that the federal government should reallocate resources to post-secondary programs offering the greatest employment opportunities. It also recommended that university resources be allocated away from the liberal arts, education and public administration and toward engineering, science and business administration.

⁵⁰ Nelsen (2002) argues that by the mid-1980s, the efforts of these groups had a noticeable impact, with university presidents starting to act more and more like corporate CEOs. To support his position, Nelsen quotes University of Regina president Lloyd Barber, who responded to a 1985 media inquiry concerning the influence of the CHEF by saying that: "If you sat around the table and listened to the discussion and didn't know, you'd be hard-pressed to know who was a university president and who was a corporate president" (p. 133). For a good illustration of CHEF's position on corporate-university relations in the 1980s, see Maxwell and Currie (1984).

same three-year period, the percentage of operating income paid for by governments declined from 72.2 percent to 63.4 percent (Tudiver 1999) and the major federal research councils were cut by 14 percent (Fisher and Rubenson 1998).⁵¹ In fact, when student enrollment is taken into account, the amount of federal transfer money spent per student declined by almost 50 percent between 1994-95 and 2004-05 (Fisher et al. 2006). Most provinces passed on these cuts to students and their families through increasing tuition and student debt. The billions of dollars in new tuition fees and student loans were built into the Liberals' financing plan. Over this time period, tuition at Canadian universities more than doubled (CFS 2007).

Also in the 1990s, provincial governments added their own unique brands of restructuring and austerity. For example, as part of its broader plan to shrink the public sector and redirect higher education toward prescribed economic goals, in 1996-97 the Harris Conservatives in Ontario reduced the overall operating grant to universities by nearly 15 percent, or \$1.55 billion (Axelrod 2008). This cut was part of a decade long trend that saw the percentage of Ontario university funding covered by provincial grants fall from 55.1 percent in 1991-92 to 39.6 percent in 1999-2000. In the case of Alberta, beginning in 1994, the government reduced its spending on higher education by 21 percent over a three-year period (Barnetson and Boberg 2000). At the same time, it introduced performance-based funding envelopes that rewarded market and market-like behaviours on the part of universities. Perhaps more than any other province, the

⁵¹ Many other changes were associated with the funding reductions of the mid-1990s. For example, according to the Association of Research Libraries, an organization that ranks libraries according to measures such as "volumes held and volumes added during the previous fiscal year," every Canadian library outside of the University of Toronto fell in ranking between 1992 and 1997 (Axelrod 2002: 114). Rankings of Canadian libraries subsequently improved in the 2000s (CAUT 2011d).

reallocation of post-secondary resources by the Alberta government was designed to achieve a specific set of policy objectives. These included increasing higher education's role as a source of vocational training as well as the amount of knowledge and technology transferred by universities to the private sector (Barnetson and Boberg 2000; Rae 1996).

Over the 1990s, universities increasingly turned to the private sector for funding as a way to compensate for public funding shortfalls (Snowdon 2005). In Ontario, for example, university revenues from all private sources increased, with corporate contributions outpacing the others with the exception of tuition fees (Robertson, McGrane and Shaker 2003). In British Columbia, private funding (excluding tuition fees) grew from 5.8 percent of university revenues in 1990-91 to 9.2 percent in 2002-03 (Malcolmson and Lee 2004). At the national level, private revenues increased by 167 percent between 1986-87 and 2001-02. Most of this increase was a product of rising tuition fees, but a considerable proportion came from corporate donations, non-governmental grants, contracts and investments (Tandem Social Research Consulting 2007). As corporatization accelerated in Canada, business leaders also became "far more insistent" about how their donations would be spent (Axelrod 1998: 9). Unlike most public funding, the donations of private benefactors – once celebrated as evidence of corporate "soulfulness" – were provided with clear expectations of direct economic returns (Miliband 1969: 224). This change has been reflected in the growing business preference for "partnerships," as opposed to general donations.

In the late 1990s, Canada started to see some reinvestments in the post-secondary system, but in very targeted ways and to support a specific policy direction. After

balancing the budget in 1997, the federal Liberals increased public expenditures to universities at the national level, even though the percentage increase in private funding continued to outpace the public contribution (Metcalf 2010). Consistent with theories of academic capitalism, university financing in this period (and continuing to the present day) has involved shifts, not necessarily reductions, in public subsidy. Some of these new “spending” initiatives came in the form of tax credits and personal education savings schemes. Others involved targeted investments in university research – such as the Canadian Foundation for Innovation and the Canada Research Chairs program – and selective grants aimed at supporting the private sector and university-industry ties. Although the budgets of the federal research granting councils increased, their priorities were reoriented in the same direction (see Chapter 8). James Turk likens the process of channelling money through special targeted programs rather than reinvesting in core funding to “putting a fancy porch on a crumbling building” (cited in Grant 2002: 262). It should also be noted that of the billions of dollars in research spending that the Liberals added between 1997-98 and 2004-05, most was allocated to a small group of research-intensive institutions (in 2004, for example, fifteen universities accounted for over 80 percent of all research income) and only 12 percent of the funding went to the social sciences and humanities (Slaughter and Rhoades 2008). These same funding disparities between and within universities are evident when looking at the allocation of funds by specific programs, like the Canada Research Chairs.

By the time the Liberal’s 13-year reign was over in 2006, Canada’s university system was a shell of its former self. According to the AUCC (2008a), overall federal and provincial government funding for university teaching and non-sponsored research fell

from more than \$17,900 per student in 1980-81 to \$9,900 in 2006-07. In 1980, governments contributed 84 percent of the funds available for these core activities, while student fees covered around 10 percent. By 2006, these shares were 66 and 24 percent respectively.⁵²

As this analysis of funding suggests, there are important differences across provinces in terms of the impact of corporatization. To be sure, examining provincial variation is important in the Canadian context and also illustrates the political nature of funding decisions through two key markers: (i) the substantial variation between provinces in their mix of public and private revenue streams, and (ii) the lack of a discernible relationship between the portion of university revenue that comes from provincial governments and the size and wealth of the province. In 2008-09, the government of Ontario provided just 37 percent of total university revenues – the second lowest in the country, while tuition fees accounted for 26 percent.⁵³ In comparison to Ontario, Nova Scotia was the only province where the government paid a smaller proportion of total revenues and students paid a larger share, at 34 and 30 percent respectively. At the other end of the spectrum, the government of Newfoundland provided 56 percent of total revenues, with its students contributing 14 percent in fees. In

⁵² The AUCC (2008a) also notes that at the beginning of the 1980s, Canadian universities had a \$2,000 per student funding advantage over US public universities. By 2007, that funding advantage had reversed, with US public institutions enjoying over \$8,000 more revenues per student.

⁵³ Looking specifically at university operating revenues in Ontario, from 1979 to 2009 the proportion of government funding declined from approximately 80 percent to 50 percent, while the proportion raised by tuition fees tripled, to 45 percent (CAUT 2011d). The Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (2010b) summarizes the impact of government cuts and underfunding as follows: “Soaring tuition, enormous classes, fewer courses, impoverished libraries, outdated labs and equipment, shabby facilities, and the exploitation of a generation of new faculty combine with a continuously eroding student-faculty ratio to reduce the quality of education offered by our institutions.”

Quebec, the provincial government provided 59 percent of funding, whereas tuition accounted for just 10 percent (OCUFA 2010a).

When the federal Conservatives took power in 2006, they increased core funding to universities. For 2008-09, the share of federal transfers earmarked for post-secondary education was increased by \$800 million – the largest increase in core transfer payments in 15 years – yet it was still \$1.2 billion short of what was needed to restore funding to 1992-93 levels (Turk 2008b). However, the government failed to set any binding conditions or legislated guidelines for the new investment, which meant that while some provinces, like Saskatchewan, increased their grants to universities, others did not and some, like British Columbia, even reduced it (CFS 2009; Gingrich 2011). These kinds of problems prompted the Senate of Canada (2011) to recommend that post-secondary education funding be removed from the Canada Social Transfer and replaced with an independent transfer to ensure dedicated funding for colleges and universities. The Conservatives have also maintained the Liberal agenda of targeted research investments, in large part to support commercialization and global competitiveness. This kind of focus has encouraged a process of institutional differentiation, both within and between universities.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Pressures in this direction are also coming from university leaders. These shifting priorities are evident in a 2008 proposal put forward by Canadian university presidents. Frustrated with the egalitarian pattern or “one size fits all” approach to higher education, the presidents of five of the country’s top research institutions – Toronto, Alberta, British Columbia, Montreal and McGill – came together to propose changes to the way that Canada’s university system is organized and funded. Under the “Big 5” proposal, federal funds would be differentially allocated to those universities that specialize in research and graduate training, and the rest who specialize in teaching and undergraduate education. Not surprisingly, the Big 5 wanted a greater share of research money and to be absolved, at least in part, of their undergraduate commitments. Critics of the proposal were quick to note that there is already growing institutional differentiation in Canada. For example, the increase in research funding over the past two decades has been narrowly concentrated; by the mid-2000s, “a clear and separable strata of research intensive universities” had emerged, with 15 schools accounting for over 80 percent of total university research income (Fisher at

At the national level, public funding made up 84 percent of university operating revenues in 1979; by 2009 this figure was reduced to just 58 percent. Over this same period, tuition fees rose from 12 to 35 percent of operating revenues, and corporate and other private fundraising has also continued to rise (CAUT 2012a). Private funding through donations, grants and bequests alone grew from approximately \$54 million in 1972 to \$2.9 billion in 2008, or from 3 to 10.8 percent of total university revenues. In 2008, almost 40 percent of this total came from corporations (CAUT 2009a). More business funding along with increased tuition fees has meant that Canada now has one of the highest proportions of private university funding in the world (CCL 2010b; Metcalfe 2010), with only five OECD countries reporting a lower percentage of public funding for post-secondary education than Canada (CAUT 2011d). Even Quebec, which has resisted the corporatization agenda relative to other provinces, has seen marked changes in private funding. Between 1988 and 2009, the proportion of university income from the private sector increased from 7.5 to 21.2 percent in the province. During this period, the proportion of university income from individuals rose from 5.4 to 12.2 percent, while income from the public sector fell from 87 to 65.8 percent (Martin and Tremblay-Pepin 2011).⁵⁵

The period of fiscal retrenchment that began in the 1970s continues today, as evidenced by the current state of funding for education nationally and how this translates across provinces. Although the federal Conservatives have maintained education transfer

al. 2009: 565). The Big 5 alone received approximately 40 percent of available funding and award 45 percent of doctoral degrees (Turk 2009).

⁵⁵ In 2012, the Quebec government launched the “Placements Universities” program, with the goal of encouraging philanthropy from individuals and corporations by providing matching grants equal to the amount of money universities raised in private donations (Beeston 2012).

payments to the provinces, they remain too low to cover inflation and enrolment increases. The government has also ignored skyrocketing student debt levels and tuition fees in recent budgets, investing instead in fighter jets, prisons, subsidies to the oil industry and billions bailing out banks. The 2013 federal budget was more of the same, with no new measures to assist struggling students and no new money for universities through the Canada Social Transfer. Similarly, many 2013 provincial budgets have deepened the austerity agenda in higher education (Charbonneau and Tamburri 2013). In Alberta, the government imposed a seven percent reduction (\$147 million) in base operating grants to the province's universities, colleges and technical institutes. British Columbia's budget included a \$46 million cut to post-secondary education. In Quebec, the government imposed cuts of \$250 million on universities. Post-secondary institutions in Manitoba, Ontario and several Atlantic provinces were also confronted with austerity measures.

To conclude, financial cutbacks and other austerity measures have been a key, driving external force of university restructuring in Canada. As Ian Angus (2009: 129) explains, the “near victory” of the corporate form in universities can be equated with “the fiscal influence of government cutbacks to education and the rise of dedicated corporate funding.” Commenting on the consequences of this underfunding, Erika Shaker (2006: 11) notes that unless or until an adequate base of public funding is restored, we will “forever be scrambling to find less effective, less accountable, less equitable, less efficient, less *public* methods of compensating” for inadequate public support.

In the final section of this chapter, I expand on this discussion of the forces shaping educational restructuring in Canada by providing an overview of global trends taking place in the area of higher education.

Global Trends in Higher Education: Internationalization or Corporatization?

Building on the earlier section of this chapter that explored how outside, global forces have shaped Canadian universities, this section reviews global trends in higher education more broadly. While a comprehensive analysis of these trends is beyond the scope of this work, in this section I briefly discuss the transformation of higher education from a global perspective in order to provide additional context for the changes taking place within Canada and to set the stage for the discussion to follow in subsequent chapters.

Those who support the process of neoliberal or corporate-led globalization draw on two primary arguments. The first is that it is an inevitable, natural and irreversible process that reflects the spread of irrevocable market forces. This claim suggests that efforts to resist this process are futile; that there are no alternatives; and that the process is not driven by any particular group. In response, I would argue that social and political systems do not emerge from natural, historical or economic laws, but from human decisions that are shaped and informed by institutional structures and relations of power. The second, related argument is that the process of globalization is the same as international integration; put another way, neoliberal globalization represents little more than the expansion of mutually beneficial cross-national relationships and the faster movement of people, ideas, goods and knowledge worldwide. In response, I, and others

cast as part of a so-called “anti-globalization” movement, would contest this claim by arguing that neoliberal globalization is a specific form of international integration that serves the interests of particular social groups by putting the rights of capital (and rich and powerful states) above all other social interests, and by shifting decision-making away from instruments of popular sovereignty.

The arguments put forward to contest the process of neoliberal globalization also apply to the changes taking place within the context of higher education. For one, the corporatization of universities, a process that operates to varying extents depending on the country under review, is not inevitable. The corporatization of education takes place in a particular social and economic context, and one can readily identify the chief architects behind it. Second, the advancement of corporatization worldwide should not be confused with the “internationalization” of higher education. Just as neoliberal globalization is one specific form of international integration, corporatization is one particular, yet powerful, variant in today’s global higher education landscape. And, just as current processes of international integration have been shaped by neoliberalism, the internationalization of higher education has been shaped by the corporatization agenda. These are important distinctions to keep in mind amidst claims that the university has to alter its practices to better serve the global marketplace, and that “anti-corporatization” critics are simply trying to block the global circulation of ideas, knowledge and innovation networks (when, in fact, most of these critics would like to see more internationalization and less corporatization). In order to more clearly delineate these two processes, it is useful to explore the concept and process associated with internationalization in more detail.

In the academic literature, the term internationalization is generally used to refer to the process of integrating an international and intercultural element into the purpose and functions of higher education. The “practice” of internationalization can include “student mobility; the recruitment of international students; the incorporation of international dimensions into the curriculum; the development of intercultural skills, competencies and global citizenship; the hiring of international faculty,” as well as many other initiatives and approaches (Shubert, Jones and Trilokekar 2009:7). Efforts to internationalize the university’s curriculum, research activities and student body long precede corporatization. For centuries, there has been international mobility among professors and students and an international dimension to research. In the post-war period especially, there was significant growth in the number of international conferences, scholarly associations, academic journals, and programs of international collaboration and exchange.

The internationalization of higher education has been associated with a number of positive initiatives and trends. These include more courses and programs with international or comparative themes;⁵⁶ growing numbers of students, professors and researchers involved in academic mobility programs; and an expansion of international research collaborations, which is often considered one of the greatest benefits of internationalization. To illustrate how widespread this collaboration is, the OECD (2009) reports that in 2007, approximately 22 percent of scientific articles involved international

⁵⁶ According to the AUCC (2008b), two-thirds of Canadian universities report enrolment increases in internationally-oriented degree programs. Moreover, almost 95 percent of universities reference the internationalization of teaching, research and service in their strategic planning documents and roughly the same percentage identify preparing internationally knowledgeable students as a key reason for internationalizing their campuses.

co-authorship, a figure three times higher than in 1985.⁵⁷ Further, global academic networks and consortia have proliferated and are no longer dominated by North American and Western European universities.⁵⁸ Taken together, and especially considering the ever-expanding network of information and communication technologies, these initiatives have the potential to expand cross-cultural competencies and the quality and quantity of academic knowledge.

Of course, internationalization cannot be understood merely as a process of mutual collaboration and exchange. Inequality among national higher education systems persists and has increased in recent decades. While the worldwide growth in higher education enrolment increased dramatically in the 2000s, participation rates improved only slightly in low-income countries (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2009). Moreover, most of the world's universities, especially in the developing world, are teaching-oriented schools that lack advanced research facilities, data networks and the capacity to produce major journals, while the US alone is home to over half of the world's top 100 research institutions (Marginson 2009). As a result, universities in the advanced industrialized

⁵⁷ International research collaboration is especially prominent in Canada; over 40 percent of scientific publications by Canadians have co-authors from other countries – double the rate of 15 years earlier. As well, co-publication rates with scholars from developing nations nearly doubled from 1992 to 2003 (AUCC 2009a). According to the AUCC (2008c), the number of international research contracts has also grown considerably. In 2006, Canadian universities completed over two thousand international research contracts worth nearly \$200 million (the majority of which came from foreign businesses). The organization also estimates that the number and value of foreign contracts doubled from 1999 to 2005.

⁵⁸ Since the 1990s, universities in the Global South (especially East Asia and South America) have expanded their participation in international university consortia. A far from exhaustive selection of today's global university associations include "Academic Consortium 21, ASEAN-European University Network, Association of African Universities, Association of Commonwealth Universities, Association of Pacific Rim Universities, Association of East Asian Research Universities, Circumpolar Universities Association, Coimbra Group, Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Compostela Group of Universities, Europaeum, European University Association, Institutional Network of the Universities from the Capitals of Europe, International Alliance of Research Universities, International Network of Universities, International Association of Universities, League of European Research Universities, Santander Group, Universitas 21, and Worldwide Universities Network" (Zha 2010).

countries continue to set the agenda for scientific and other academic research. In addition, there is a net “brain drain” of academic talent from the global south to the global north, and scholarship that originates in languages other than English (and uses non-Western knowledge traditions) is systematically excluded from global knowledge networks.⁵⁹ As well, global intellectual property arrangements – created and enforced by the World Trade Organization, the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement (TRIPS) – ensure that the material benefits of knowledge production flow largely in the same direction.⁶⁰ Related to this, proposed changes to the way branch campuses (many of which are located in developing nations) operate may further exacerbate these unequal relationships. According to Geoff Maslen (2012c), these proposals would see the conversion of the “branch campus model into fully fledged multinational universities by slicing up the global value chain in ways akin to multinational corporations.” This change could mean designing degree programs tailored precisely to corporate interests or “using

⁵⁹ According to Sylvia Van de Bunt-Kokhuis (2004), there are between 60,000 and 100,000 scientific journals worldwide, but only about 3000 of these journals are indexed by the Institute for Scientific Information and most of these are published only in English. As well, most of the major journals are edited by senior scholars from the advanced capitalist nations. This incongruity with respect to journal publishing is compounded by the fact that ten times as many books are translated from English to other languages as are translated from other languages into English (Marginson 2007). International ranking systems also tend to favour universities that use English as their main language in teaching and research. For example, most rankings use the Thomson Reuters and SciVerse-Scopus databases, which mainly track articles in English journals on sciences and engineering. Recent evidence also suggests a marked worldwide shift toward teaching courses and programs in English (Green et al. 2012). For a useful overview of some of the other problems facing developing countries in the “global brain race,” see Altbach (2013).

⁶⁰ A central premise behind the GATS and TRIPS agreements is that knowledge is a commodity like any other. One of their goals is to facilitate open markets and protections for the owners (sellers) of knowledge-based products. The GATS rules are also designed to promote “free trade” in higher educational services by guaranteeing market access for all providers, including foreign-owned for-profit companies (in the WTO’s view, barriers to trade include public “subsidies” to higher education that restrict the ability of private providers to compete for students). Put simply, “trade in services” is a euphemism for handing over governmental functions, including education, to private power. Troubling questions have been raised in recent years about the potential impact of the GATS on public education in Canada (see, for example, Cohen 2000; Kachur 2003; and Robinson 2006).

a developing country to do research because it is cheaper to build better infrastructure and hire researchers of similar quality to those at home.”

According to the 2005 International Association of Universities’ (IAU) Internationalization Survey, there is an overwhelming academic consensus – including 96 percent of responding institutions in 95 countries – that internationalization brings some benefits to higher education (Knight 2008). At the same time, however, the Survey also pointed to some of the risks associated with internationalization. The number one risk identified – in both developed and developing nations – was “the commodification and commercialization of education programs.” The move towards commodification and commercialization can be seen, for example, in the large growth of private educational providers. Private institutions of higher learning, many of them for-profit, represent the fastest growing sector worldwide (their recent difficulties in Canada notwithstanding). Today, roughly 30 percent of global higher education enrolment is private (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2009).⁶¹

In addition to the risks associated with internationalization exacerbating inequalities between nations and commercializing education programs, even the supposed benefits (many of which were outlined above) of this process have to be called into question in the current context. As Jiang (2008) explains, market-driven ideologies of neoliberalism and corporatization are redefining the benefits of internationalization according to narrowly-conceived economic criteria. In this scheme, international student mobility is viewed less in terms of enriching campuses and expanding cultural knowledge

⁶¹ The potential for further growth in the for-profit higher education sector was recently highlighted at a 2011 forum in Vancouver, where 120 university and corporate leaders from over 20 countries met to explore how higher education could best be expanded around the world. For most of the conference participants, the for-profit sector represented the chosen path of expansion.

and more in terms of using specific recruitment strategies to attract private income and maximize revenue. Similarly, under corporatization, the benefits of cross-national research alliances are less about broad cultural/social projects or the production of public goods and more focused on enhancing economic competition. Led by organizations like the OECD and the World Bank, many countries have converged around a “strategic science policy regime,” which involves harnessing academic science to support economic development and competitiveness. For example, the explicit goal of Canada’s science and technology (S&T) strategy is to boost economic competitiveness and foster international research networks in areas of strategic importance to the Canadian economy (Government of Canada 2007). To this end, the federal government has provided tens of millions of dollars in support of international S&T cooperation – including recent bilateral agreements with China, Brazil and India – formed as part of the International Science and Technology Partnership Program. Similarly, through its Global Commerce Strategy, the government is pursuing S&T agreements with numerous other partners in order to strengthen what it calls Canada’s “international commercialization network” (Government of Canada 2009). This shift in Canada, and elsewhere, demonstrates how the discourses of neoliberal globalization and corporatization have penetrated the visions, goals and practices of the modern research university (Gaffikin and Perry 2009; AUCC 2008a).

Broadly speaking, the neoliberal edict of global economic competitiveness has had significant impacts on higher education worldwide. Nearly two decades ago, John Calvert and Larry Kuehn (1993: 104-105) predicted that the forces of globalization (and particularly free trade) would lead to greater corporate involvement in Canadian

universities by unleashing “new competitive pressures and a new business culture both in the wider economy and in post-secondary institutions themselves.” They theorized that these pressures, in turn, would “push governments to make commercial viability the basis of continued funding of educational programs.” This prediction has come to pass – in Canada and around the world. Universities have been repositioned as engines of innovation and are often defined, valued and supported based on the extent to which they help governments and corporations to compete internationally. As an example, the “Bologna Process” and the creation of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) – both efforts to integrate European higher education systems in more than 40 countries – were designed as part of the European Union’s “Lisbon Strategy” to make Europe more economically competitive (Tomusk 2006; Robertson and Keeling 2008; Bagué, Comerma and Terradas 2010). The chief sponsors of the process, which include the European Commission, view international competitiveness and the creation of knowledge-based products for the global marketplace as the most important advantages of the EHEA. The EHEA was also designed to improve Europe’s attractiveness in its competition for international students. And, in the view of its proponents, all of these changes are derived from and dependent upon a more intimate relationship between universities and industry.

Universities in the global south have also been impacted by global economic forces, including the restructuring mandates imposed on them by institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF). Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2006: 70) argues that faculty governance is one of the World Bank’s primary objects of university reform. In his words, “the reformist zeal of the World Bank reverberates wherever it identifies the weakness of the public university, the power held by faculty being one of its

main targets.” For Bank officials, 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.”⁶² The IMF supports a similar agenda. For example, it often makes educational restructuring a loan requirement by insisting on such measures as market-based curriculum reform and increasing the proportion of contract faculty to promote institutional “flexibility.” The goals of these kinds of reforms are always the same: to facilitate a more favourable investment climate for business.

Similarly, in his work on Latin America, Andrés Bernasconi (2007) has shown how universities have been forced to seek a closer alignment with corporatization policies. Within higher education, he says, a new legitimacy for market relevant curricula and restricting student access based on a user-pay model has changed academic cultures. With regard to faculty governance and institutional flexibility, the World Bank and the IMF would be pleased with the results: the number of part-time academics has increased sharply and now comprises up to 80 percent of the professoriate (Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley 2009). Perhaps the greatest shift in the character of higher education in Latin America has been a move away from the idea of the university as an instrument of progressive social change. According to Bernasconi, new policy regimes are forcing universities to “do away with the dominant discourse of social transformation characteristic of the Latin American model” (p. 33). The notion of “extension” – the

⁶² Jamil Salmi (2009) describes these objectives in a recent World Bank report on university governance, which argues that the “tight,” “rigid” and “cumbersome” governing structures of the public university must be transformed in order to facilitate corporatization. See Johnstone (1998) for a candid exposition of the World Bank’s position on “radical restructuring” in higher education.

traditional third function of the Latin American model – no longer means “bringing the poor to the university and the university to the poor but, rather, a wide array of money-making endeavours such as continuing education, consulting, and technical transfer to industry” (p. 43).⁶³ These changes are also reflected in the nature of intellectual work taking place in the region, with research agendas shifting from critical studies of dependence, inequality, power and social movements to more technocratic and commissarial scholarship in order to access external sources of financial support.

To conclude, it is important to draw attention to the fact that corporatization is implicated in the process of internationalization in two key ways. First, the processes by which higher education is becoming more globally integrated (e.g., commercial research collaboration and international student recruitment practices) are characteristic of the corporatization agenda. Second, neoliberal globalization and welfare state retrenchment have resulted in a series of convergent pressures on universities. This global context is important because it highlights where there are convergent trends and impacts across countries and where there are important differences.

Comparative analyses of restructuring demonstrate a convergence of outcomes in most nations (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Currie and Newson 1998; Schuetze and Bruneau 2004; Jones, McCarney and Skolnik 2005; Rhoads and Torres 2006; Vincent-Lancrin 2006; Vossensteyn 2009). As Slaughter (1998: 47) has argued, “globalization is a universal force to which countries, states, and provinces develop unique responses, but the system effects are so powerful that higher education policy in some areas – access, curricula, research, autonomy for faculty and institutions – converge.” A recent report by

⁶³ For a more comprehensive account of university restructuring in Latin America, see Rhoads and Torres (2006).

Pam Marcucci and Alex Usher (2012) of the Canadian consulting group Higher Education Strategy Associates lends support to the convergence thesis. Drawing on data from 40 countries, the authors note that cuts to higher education spending occurred across the globe in 2011. Even in those countries where funding levels were maintained or increased,

the trend towards more private investment continues unabated. In virtually every region of the world, given increasing enrolments, rising costs and the ongoing competition for public resources from other critical public sector services, higher education institutions are being pushed to increase their income from sources such as student tuition fees, donations, faculty consulting and facility rentals (p. 3).

At the same time, however, research demonstrates that neoliberal globalization does not exert homogenizing effects on national policies or institutions. That is, although similar processes of educational restructuring are underway, the onset, scale and intensity of change still varies considerably between and even within nations based a complex set of factors. One key factor underlying cross-national differentiation is whether education is primarily vested in regional or national governments. According to Hans Schuetze and William Bruneau (2004), Canadian federalism (or the lack of centralization) has helped to prevent the kinds of sweeping reforms that have occurred in countries like the UK, Australia and New Zealand. Another determining factor, of course, is the nature and extent of resistance efforts. At the time of this writing, for example, hundreds of thousands of students in Canada, Chile, Greece and the Philippines are participating in social movements against the corporatization of higher education.

Chapter Four: University Teaching and the Casualization of Academic Labour

Having provided the historical and other contextual information necessary to understand the corporatization of universities in Canada, the remainder of this study presents detailed analyses of specific aspects of universities that have changed under corporatization. This analysis begins in this chapter with a discussion of how corporate influences and corporate restructuring have impacted university teaching, and with it the nature of academic work. The focus here is on three main aspects. First, I explain the impacts of corporatization on the relationship between teaching and research, specifically how the importance attached to university research has increased at the same time as the resources and institutional supports for teaching have declined. Second, I briefly explore the influence of corporatization on how and where university teaching takes place by looking at changes in online education within public (and private) universities in Canada. Finally, I focus the remainder of the chapter on what I see as one of most marked shifts in universities under corporatization: the casualization of academic labour.

Changing Priorities: The Teaching-Research Nexus

For most of its history, teaching was the primary obligation of the public university. The overriding importance of teaching to the university's mission is evident, for example, in the views of prominent Canadian scholars and administrators in the post-war period (Neatby 1985). Over time, research also assumed a central place in institutions of higher learning. Moreover, the obligations of teaching and research are often seen as closely tied to one another or even interdependent, where research is seen to be improved by an active

commitment to student learning, and teaching is most effective when combined with an active involvement in research. The interdependence, or unity, of teaching and research has come to define an important ideal about what the university – and university scholarship – should be. This ideal is often traced to the “Humboldtian” university model in Germany, which assumes that the teaching and research components of faculty work, to which service to the institution is often added as a third, cannot be divided without losing the important connections that make up the whole. Building on this assumption, what presumably distinguishes university teachers from other educators is that they are actively engaged in knowledge production, not simply knowledge transmission. As Ian Angus (2009: 85-86) explains, underlying the unity of teaching and research is the belief that a field of knowledge “is seen very differently by a person who is in the process of contributing to its current state than by someone who simply accepts the current state as given.” It is also necessary for students, as future knowledge producers, to “experience through the university researcher/teacher an *active* organization of a field such that currently interesting questions could be advanced by further research” (p. 85-86).

In principle, the unity of teaching and research remains a foundational concept in Canadian universities. I would emphasize, however, that there are growing tensions in this relationship, especially in the context of corporatization. For one, research has overcome teaching in many respects. In 1990, the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education, Ernest Boyer, famously denounced the university’s overemphasis on research at the expense of undergraduate teaching. Boyer called for a redefinition of scholarship that would restore teaching and service to their central position in academia. Boyer also referenced a study by the Carnegie Foundation showing that

teaching was the primary interest of 70 percent of professors surveyed.⁶⁴ That same year, a similar study was commissioned by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). The companion report by Stuart Smith (1991) argued that the growing primacy of research in the Canadian academy had detrimental effects on undergraduate education. Both Boyer and Smith also drew attention to the fact that the nominal distribution of effort in faculty work, which assumes 40 percent for research, 40 percent for teaching, and 20 percent for service, was being challenged to support a stronger emphasis on research.⁶⁵

Related to this, research has come to be defined as more prestigious and valued than teaching. As a result, an institution's status and reputation is generally now defined more by the name recognition of its researchers than by quality teaching or student learning. A recent study of 34 universities found that regardless of a university's policies on teaching, most faculty indicated that research was the key priority of their institutions (Jaschik 2011). Others studies have had similar results. A survey by the Ontario Government's Higher Education Quality Council, for instance, found that only 61 percent of professors believed that teaching was important to their institutions, while 70 percent believed that research was more valuable than teaching in enhancing one's academic reputation and

⁶⁴ More recent research supports Boyer's conclusion that teaching is the core value of the professoriate (Leslie 2002). The public also appears to believe that the legitimacy of the university rests on its ability to provide high quality undergraduate instruction. A survey by Ekos Research Associates (2003), for example, found that teaching was the most important factor, by a wide margin, for Ontarians in considering university quality.

⁶⁵ Universities differ in terms of how these priorities are institutionalized. For instance, the collective agreement at the University of Guelph allows for individual variations in the mix of teaching, research and service that are required for specific periods of time. Similarly, the collective agreement at the University of Western Ontario allows faculty members to request different types of workloads. The agreement at Western also states that teaching and research should be equally important in tenure and promotion. However, as Sanders (2011) notes, it is not certain whether these kinds of policies are used constructively to recognize career variation and strengthen institutions, or whether they simply punish a lack of research productivity with heavier teaching loads.

access to funds (Serebrin 2010). Another survey of Ontario faculty found that the proportion of respondents who said that research was their institution's top priority was more than double the proportion who believed that their institution valued teaching above other aspects of academic work (OCUFA 2012b).

It follows that research productivity is now the strongest indicator of faculty compensation in Canada. According to one study, high quality instruction – including measures such as the amount of time spent in the classroom – was found to be either unrelated, or negatively related, to rates of pay (Usher and Potter 2006). Moreover, Phaneuf et al. (2007) have shown that research is clearly favoured over both teaching and service in promotion reviews at Canadian universities. As it stands now, an established record of published research can override a poor teaching record in hiring, tenure and promotion decisions. In some cases, having fewer teaching commitments has actually come to be associated with higher professorial status in the academy; the most renowned scholars usually teach the least, often as a reward for research productivity or success in obtaining external grants. The result is a “strange and perverse” system, whereby “experienced professors, who have had time to reflect on the nature, problems, and prospects of their subject and its relationship to other subjects, generally teach specialized courses to small classes, while inexperienced sessional lecturers deal with basic questions in large classes” (Pocklington and Tupper 2002: 56). Sessional or contract faculty (discussed in detail in the second half of this chapter) are under no obligation to conduct research as part of their jobs and are not compensated for doing so. Noting the reliance of universities on contract staff, Pocklington and Tupper (2002: 112) contend that only two conclusions are possible:

First, either research is not required to be an effective teacher and university practice contradicts university ideology about teaching and research. Or second, if mutual enrichment is true, universities' practice of employing part-time, nonresearching professors is an admission that undergraduates receive an inferior education. Universities cannot logically claim that teaching and research are intertwined to the benefit of students when they employ professors who are not required to do research.

Not surprisingly, shifting perspectives on the value of teaching and research have had an impact on how resources are allocated within university institutions. In the context of the corporatization, I would argue that one of the most distinguishing differences is that universities are devoting a greater proportion of their resources to research. This attention includes concerted efforts to attract "star" researchers to their campuses. These celebrated professors, who often teach very little, can have a significant impact on university prestige and the (market) value of academic programs. As a result, alternative investments in areas such as curriculum or professional development are often pushed to the bottom of the agenda (Kirp 2003). A good illustration of this reorienting of priorities can be found in the 2010 *Report of the Steering Committee on Resource Optimization* for the University of Ottawa, which notes that the university recently made a "strategic decision to become more research intensive," yet the "progressive reduction in teaching loads necessary to enable professors more time to dedicate to research activities" has led to financial strain (p. 5). To free up money for its research mandate and achieve the desired teaching reductions, the Committee recommended the following: reducing course offerings; increasing class sizes; cutting bursaries, scholarships and teaching assistants by nearly \$5 million; downgrading library collections; and reducing support services for

both students and teachers.⁶⁶ Similar “resource optimization” reviews have been conducted at other Canadian universities. At the University of Manitoba, the process led to the closure of its Learning Technology Centre, while at the University of Calgary, it resulted in significant staff reductions (CUPE 2010c).

At the same time as changes have taken place at the institutional level, there have also been changes in the nature of the day-to-day work lives and responsibilities of faculty members. In fact, in Canada and elsewhere, there has been a substantial rise in research-related expectations and tasks for a range of faculty. Competition for grants has intensified and more time is required to prepare funding applications and manage other “accountability” requirements, especially for projects involving external partnerships. According to the AUCC (2007a), a survey of 6,000 US researchers found that 42 percent of the time professors allocated for research was actually taken up by research-related administrative work. In some disciplines, greater expectations also exist for faculty to advance research with commercial applications. On this point, evidence suggests a negative relationship between faculty entrepreneurialism and commitment to teaching (Lee and Rhoads 2004).⁶⁷ Not only can a preoccupation with research detract from teaching and pedagogical commitments, it has been associated with a steady decline in “academic citizenship” – defined as participation in and commitment to institutional governance and administrative service – in most major North American universities (Thompson, Constantineau and Fallis 2006).

⁶⁶ Specifically in the area of “Teaching Learning Support Services,” the document suggests that additional revenues to offset the recommended cuts might be generated by inviting corporate sponsors to attend teaching/pedagogy events on campus and “charging a fee for the booths where they can display their products or services” (p. 40).

⁶⁷ Not surprisingly, the study by Lee and Rhoads (2004) also shows that compared with smaller schools, large research-oriented institutions are especially prone to neglect undergraduate teaching.

The seemed unity between teaching and research has also been challenged by the differentiation of the full time faculty role through the creation of teaching-only streams. Some teaching stream positions currently exist in most Ontario universities, and they are becoming more common in other parts of the country (Sanders 2011; Vajoczki 2011). Moreover, several universities in Canada now explicitly restrict research activity and are considered “teaching-first” institutions. Examples include Fraser Valley, Kwantlen and Vancouver Island universities, all of which are located in British Columbia and received their university status in 2008. For Ian Clark and his colleagues (2009: 108), these changes signify that the “teacher-researcher is in retreat, and the vision of a university system where almost all students are taught by teacher-researchers is no longer with us.” Ontario has also been considering proposals to construct three entirely teaching-oriented universities, where the “distractions” of research activities would be reduced (see Clark, Trick and Van Loon 2011). While these proposals are often framed in terms of the need to improve access and the quality of education, the ultimate goal appears to be cost-reduction. And, like the use of contract labour and teaching-stream positions, the proposals are based on the assumption that it does not undermine teaching and learning to decouple them from academic research.⁶⁸ At the same time, the proposals tend to ignore, or at least not be concerned with, how institutional differentiation might facilitate a two-tier system of university education, or the fact that many are opposed to the separation of teaching and research. For example, a recent survey of over 2,000 Ontario faculty and

⁶⁸ This line of thinking is also evident in the 2012 Report of the Commission on the Reform of Ontario’s Public Services – otherwise known as the “Drummond Report” – headed by economist Don Drummond. The similarity in viewpoints is not surprising, given that Drummond relied heavily on the work of Clark, Trick and Van Loon (2011). The report considers the issue of institutional differentiation through the lens of cost-cutting and recommends that smaller universities de-emphasize research and devote a greater proportion of their resources to teaching, including more teaching-only streams. For a more thorough critique of the Drummond Report, see OCUFA (2012a).

academic librarians found that 91 percent of respondents agreed (64 percent “strongly agreed”) that teaching by faculty who are active in research is an important part of a university education (OCUFA 2012c). Moreover, a recent public survey found that more than two-thirds of Ontarians believe that universities must combine research with teaching in order to fulfill their mandate (OCUFA 2013).

Of course, it is not only a shift in the relative value of teaching and research that has changed institutional arrangements and priorities. Under corporatization, funding mandates are also heavily influenced by external – and especially corporate – research alliances. To participate in corporate research partnerships, universities must “spend significant funds developing proposals, attracting partners, building labs, and purchasing equipment. They also need to support a growing cadre of administrators and other specialists to help broker and negotiate complex agreements, monitor them, and resolve inevitable conflicts” (Polster 2007b: 320). These observations are supported by considerable evidence, some of which has been reported in the mainstream press. For example, relying on data from Statistics Canada and the Canadian Association of University Business Officers, W.D. Smith (2010) found that sponsored research in Canada’s 25 largest universities accounted for 14.9 percent of university expenditures in 1988; by 2008, this figure had grown to 24.7 percent. This increase in sponsored research related expenditures coincided with parallel declines in general operating expenditures – including in areas central to undergraduate teaching – and academic salaries. Smith (2010) concludes that “teaching has not just fallen down the priority list; it has been pushed there by conscious resource allocation decisions. Less money is reaching the classroom.”

At a broader level, some critics have challenged the assumption that the relationship between teaching and research is or ever could be a harmonious one. Alex Usher and Andrew Potter (2006: 47), for example, liken excellence/productivity in teaching and research to a “zero-sum game,” where any relationship that exists between them is likely to be antagonistic rather than mutually reinforcing. Similarly, Clark et al. (2009) argue that there is little relation between excellence in teaching and excellence in research; instructors who are not active researchers are no more or less effective in the classroom than tenured professors.⁶⁹ Tom Pocklington and Allan Tupper (2002) perhaps go even further, arguing that in the current era of research specialization and the preoccupation with commercial concerns, a lot of university research detracts from teaching and is removed from the needs of undergraduate students. Further, instructing students who have not yet achieved a mastery of their disciplines requires teachers who are adept at “reflective inquiry” – an intellectual process aimed at largeness or breadth of vision – not those who are consumed by specialized “frontier” research or a “publish or perish” mentality. It is worth noting that some high level university administrators have also questioned the viability of this relationship between teaching and research. In a 2011 report on undergraduate education produced by the AUCC (2011c), Robert Campbell, president of Mount Allison University, is cited as noting that “[w]e all feel and know that the character of the undergraduate experience has deteriorated in our lifetimes, especially so in the last decades” (p. 1). Another university president expressed frustration that institutional status is no longer “built on teaching. The things that really determine the reputation of our institutions right now are research and attracting high-profile talent and

⁶⁹ Some of the international research supporting the position that effective teachers do not have to be active researchers was recently summarized by Adam Chapnick (2012) in *University Affairs*.

big infrastructure. What doesn't count is teaching, the local interests, engaging in civil society" (p. 4).

These trends make clear that the logic of the corporatized university holds that knowledge production should be reserved for a minority of well-compensated research-driven scholars with few teaching commitments, while knowledge transmission should be relegated to lesser valued, and lesser paid, instructors. Regardless of what one believes about the interdependence of teaching and research, I would emphasize that corporatization has reduced the capacity for these two activities to be mutually reinforcing. Put simply, corporatization has been a key driving force behind the apparent "decline" of the integrated teacher-researcher model. And although Canadian universities continue to position teaching as an important ideal – or at least as equal to research – the reality is very different. For educational administrators, liberal education is too often seen as a costly and time-consuming irrelevance. It is for this reason that they increasingly rely on contract faculty to assume a greater proportion of teaching responsibilities. Before turning to a detailed examination of contract faculty in Canadian universities, I will discuss how corporatization has also shifted, to varying extents, how higher education is provided through examining the growth of online education and the commodification of instruction.

Digital Diploma Mills?

In 2001, education critic David Noble published *Digital Diploma Mills*.⁷⁰ Noble's main goal was to draw attention to the commodification and commercialization of university education by means of online course delivery. Beginning in the 1990s, Noble argued, a major campaign was initiated by universities, in alliance with software, hardware and courseware companies (including Kodak, IBM, Microsoft, McGraw-Hill, Prentice-Hall, Rogers Cablesystems, Unitel, Novasys, Nortel, Bell Canada, and MPR Teltech, a research subsidiary of GTE) to bring higher education into a "Virtual U" network of lucrative profit centres. The objectives of this network were to expand the marketplace for instructional materials and advance high technology educational programs.

The rise of online course delivery took place in line with the growth of for-profit institutions of higher education, the vast majority of which offer courses largely or exclusively online. This industry barely existed twenty years ago and then began to grow in select areas, most notably the US. Many expected that Canadian higher education would undergo a similar shift, but only a small number of private institutions materialized. For example, the DeVry Institute of Technology (a US-based company) moved to Canada and was given the right to grant academic degrees by the government of Alberta in 2001. And while there were concerns that more institutions of this kind would be opened in Canada when the Ontario government passed the *Postsecondary Choice and Excellence Act* in 2001, which formally granted private degree-granting

⁷⁰ *Digital Diploma Mills* (2001) was based on a series of essays (available online) that Noble wrote over the course of the previous decade. It has been widely speculated that Noble's opposition to the commercialization of instruction was a key reason why administrators at Simon Fraser University intervened to block his appointment to the J.S. Woodsworth Chair of the Humanities in 2001.

institutions the ability to operate in the province,⁷¹ the large predicted influx of profit-driven universities never materialized. Nevertheless, some individual Canadian institutions have embraced online learning. These include Royal Roads and Thompson Rivers universities in British Columbia, Télé-université Quebec (a component of the Université du Québec à Montréal) and Athabasca University in Alberta. Describing itself as “Canada’s Open University,” Athabasca is the one major university in Canada that offers its programs solely through distance education. With annual enrolments of approximately 32,000 students, Athabasca seemingly merges the demands of education and vocational training and embraces a consumerist model of higher learning. Several other institutions, such as Memorial University in Newfoundland, have also made a significant transition to e-learning. Recently, Ontario became the latest province to announce its plans to create a fully online university – the Ontario Online Institute. Today in Canada, two collaborative networks really represent the online agenda in higher education. The first, Canadian Virtual University, is a consortium of Canada's leading universities specializing in online and distance education that operates in collaboration with industry and business associations. The second is the Collaboration for Online Higher Education and Research, which focuses its efforts on the research and practice of online as well as “blended” learning, or the integration of face-to-face and virtual education.

The emergence of for-profit institutions of higher learning, online institutions and these online networks has been met with faculty and other resistance. In 1997, for

⁷¹ Opposition to the new law was widespread, and included student unions, faculty associations, politicians and academics. The Canadian Union of Public Employees described the new law as “by far the biggest and most destructive step down the road to privatizing post-secondary education” (CUPE 2001).

example, professors at York University launched a strike that was driven, in part, to challenge unilateral administrative actions in the area of instructional technologies. Notable among the list of faculty grievances was an official solicitation by the university inviting corporations to place their logos on online courses in exchange for a fee. For Noble, this strike represented the first organized opposition in Canada to the “unholy alliance” of university, corporate and political actors who were attempting to streamline online higher education (p. 51). A short time later, the threat of a faculty strike at Acadia University forced administrators (and their partners at IBM) to rescind their demands for online course development. Faculties at many other Canadian universities have also organized actions to oppose these kinds of initiatives. It is important to note that these resistance activities do not tend to target online instruction or “technology” per se, as most see online learning as useful for certain purposes (e.g., expanding access to education for people who are unable to be on campus, and enhancing classroom instruction through the use of new tools). What faculty were and continue to be primarily concerned about are those features of online education that weaken student learning and align with the corporatization agenda.

There are three specific areas of concern. First, my research suggests that online education is often touted and used as a way to increase educational productivity and “efficiency.” This efficiency is ostensibly obtained by (i) substituting cheap contract labour for the labour of full-time faculty, and (ii) facilitating a process of academic deskilling, or de-professionalization, by “unbundling” faculty work (Turk 2008b). In other words, rather than having one professor develop and deliver a course, the teaching process can be broken down into discrete parts (e.g., course design, course delivery,

student evaluation, logistic support) that are performed by different workers, all of whom are supervised and scrutinized by managerial professionals. Similarly, online education is said to enhance efficiency because technology workstations are not restricted by tenure or academic freedom, and they are easier to control and “retrain” than tenured professors. For some university administrators, breaking the faculty “monopoly” on knowledge and certification has the added benefit of increasing their power relative to the professoriate.⁷²

Second, there are concerns about intellectual property, or the question of who owns the rights to course materials developed for online use. Just as some universities have taken patent rights away from researchers in order to engage in academic capitalism, wresting copyrights away from teaching faculty – the legal “authors” of course materials – to sell or licence courseware further advances the corporatization process. In some instances, universities are attempting to appropriate intellectual property rights from professors not simply to make online ventures financially viable but also to facilitate the “unbundling” of faculty work. In fact, Noble (2001) argued that the conversion of courses to courseware could lead to the worst case scenario of dispensing with university faculty altogether. There is also the risk, already documented in several US universities, of virtual courses becoming little more than company training workshops. The University of Texas at Austin, for example, has developed an online degree in science, technology and commercialization that caters exclusively to students who work at IBM. Another American college has tailored an online degree specifically for Intel workers (Giroux 2007a).

⁷² For a good illustration of this line of thinking, see Massy and Zemsky 1995.

Third, online learning can have detrimental impacts on student learning. When a leaked discussion paper revealed that the government of Ontario was considering plans for undergraduate programs to deliver 60 percent of courses through online methods, Ontario faculty were asked to respond. Interestingly, 82 percent agreed (60 percent “strongly” agreed) that expanding online course delivery would harm the quality of student education (OCUFA 2012c). Online learning is problematic for students for two main reasons: it challenges the integrated teacher-researcher model, and it often functions through pedagogical models and delivery methods that rely on standardized, pre-packaged curricula. In other words, what is normally emphasized in online education is training and rote learning (the downloading of information) as opposed to creativity and critical thinking that can be developed in a social context. This method of learning runs contrary to those who understand education as a labour-intensive process that entails an interpersonal and inter-subjective – not merely an interactive – relationship between individuals (Nelsen 1997b). According to Noble (2001: 4), this represents “the one utterly unambiguous result of a century of educational research.”

While online educational activities and “courseware” production are used by some universities in Canada, online education has not become the dominant educational feature that Noble predicted. For one, for-profit institutions, where these kinds of educational programs tend to be housed, continue to struggle. In fact, many in the US having gone bankrupt, and those that did open in Canada never really took hold. In 2008, for example,

the University of Phoenix⁷³ closed all of its Canadian operations; its campuses in Burnaby and Calgary were officially shut down in 2010. Others also closed, including Meritus University, Lansbridge University and University Canada West.⁷⁴ The problems facing these profit-oriented universities in Canada were connected to enrolment issues and faltering profits, as well as legal and ethical violations by many of these institutions.⁷⁵ Moreover, to date, relatively few public institutions in Canada have made a significant conversion to full e-learning courses and programs. The considerable

⁷³ The University of Phoenix is an online university and the largest for-profit educational provider in the world. According to its critics, the University of Phoenix epitomizes all that is wrong with for-profit higher education. Approximately 95 percent of its instructors are part-time and courses are written at university headquarters by a team of faculty working with industry representatives, thereby separating the production of course content from its delivery. In this way, the university operates in many ways like a chain of retail stores offering a standardized “product” to its consumers. Moreover, companies can hire the university to tailor its curriculum in particular directions, which effectively eliminates the pretence of “offering anything other than training for the corporate workplace” (Woodhouse 2009: 241). According to Ana Marie Cox (2003: 16, 23), “Phoenix has done more than almost any other education enterprise to shift the meaning of college from that of a process one goes through to a product one buys.” For Cox, educational vendors like the University of Phoenix are “the Enrons of higher education: built on a bubble of good feeling, sustained by a siphoning off of public goods and monies.” Sam Dillon (2007) of *The New York Times* recently reported that the university’s graduation rate is just 16 percent.

⁷⁴ Like the University of Phoenix, Meritus University is a subsidiary of the Apollo Group. It closed in British Columbia in 2007. Shortly thereafter, Meritus was approved to offer programs in New Brunswick, but later announced it was closing after only two years in operation. Lansbridge University, also based in New Brunswick, had its accreditation revoked in 2010. Around the same time, University Canada West shut down its degree programs in Victoria.

⁷⁵ For example, the Vancouver branch of Lansbridge University was closed by the BC government in 2007 for violating the province’s Degree Authorization Act; charges against the University included illegal advertising, exposing students to financial risk and providing misleading information to government. A few years later, the university lost its degree-granting status in its New Brunswick branch due to non-compliance with provincial regulations and the substandard quality of its academic programming (Chapin 2010). Similarly, the activities of for-profit institutions have been exposed in the US. According to *The New York Times*, a US federal court previously filed a lawsuit against the University of Phoenix for fraudulently obtaining hundreds of millions of dollars in financial aid. Following the lawsuit, the US Department of Education issued a report concluding that the university “systematically operates in a duplicitous matter” (Dillon 2007). *The Washington Post* also reported on the findings of an investigation by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) into the recruitment techniques of 15 for-profit colleges. The investigation found evidence of “fraud, deception [and] questionable marketing practices,” including college officials urging applicants to “invent children” and to hide savings in order to leverage financial aid (de Vise 2010). More recently, a two-year investigation into the US for-profit higher education industry revealed widespread evidence of poor quality programs, poor graduation rates, “sky-high” dropout rates, high rates of student loan default, as well as aggressive and misleading recruitment tactics. The investigation also found that the 30 companies examined in the report spent less on student instruction than they did on marketing and advertising (Kirkham 2012).

resources required for these ventures (and the inability of universities to appropriate course-related intellectual property rights from faculty) have made many online initiatives unfeasible. In the US, Gary Rhoades (2006: 386) goes so far as to call the movement toward copyrighting in educational materials “the academic equivalent of the dot.com bust.” And there have been counter movements. Since the early 2000s, hundreds of universities worldwide have joined the open courseware movement, publishing their academic materials openly on the internet in a wide range of disciplines and languages.⁷⁶

To these well-documented challenges, I would add that online education has not taken hold to the extent that was predicted because university administrators – in Canada and elsewhere – have relied more on the casualization of academic labour than on virtual education schemes to deskill the professoriate and “unbundle” faculty work. That is, the commodification critiques of Noble and others have not adequately accounted for the more fundamental process of labour market restructuring that has taken place as universities become increasingly corporatized. Similar to the business world, labour-replacing and labour-transforming technologies in higher education are part of a broader

⁷⁶ One of the most famous examples was when MIT announced, in 2001, that it would make all of its course materials freely accessible online and “allow” faculty to retain the ownership. The open courseware movement has the potential to radically alter the higher education landscape. One of the most significant trends in this direction is the Massive Open Online Courseware (MOOC) movement, which, according to Simon Marginson (2012) has been “reverberating through the world’s universities like a tectonic shock.” The chief suppliers of MOOCs are Coursera, edX and Udacity. At the time of this writing, the University of Toronto and the University of British Columbia are offering several MOOCs through Coursera, while the University of Alberta is preparing to launch a MOOC with Udacity. University marketing and branding are motivating these initiatives and there is reason to expect that these “free” services will eventually serve as platforms for advertising and commercial endeavours. Critics are also concerned about the corporate drive for profit and the accumulation of information behind MOOCs (Ogrizek 2013). Perhaps the most significant threat, however, is that with the emergence of MOOCs, colleges and universities have begun to (re)-assert ownership of the courses that their faculty members develop. If successful, this could lead universities to claim ownership of other scholarly products covered by copyright, such as books, making the MOOC issue central to the conflict over intellectual property in the university. At the same time, these initiatives could represent positive steps toward non-commodified or even democratic learning. Open access systems affirm the principle that knowledge and education are non-excludable public goods.

political and economic transformation. And it is this more general transformation of the academic workforce that poses the greatest threat to public higher education. The remainder of the chapter addresses this transformation in detail.

The Casualization of Academic Labour: Contract Faculty in Canada

In 2008, the longest university strike in English-speaking Canada took place at York University when 3,400 contract faculty, research and teaching assistants walked off the job for 85 days. While the main issues of dispute were wages and working conditions for contract academic staff, the strike was viewed by many as a broader political struggle against neoliberal restructuring in the university. The strike ended only after the provincial government imposed back to work legislation. This legislation effectively allowed the university to continue to save millions of dollars each year by relying on contract instructors rather than renewing its tenured workforce. It also thwarted the possibility that the strike would be used as a precedent setting event for improving the job security and working conditions of contract faculty across Canada. The victory for the administration was as much political as it was economic. Incorporating principles of greater job security for contract staff into the collective agreement would have interfered with the broader process of educational restructuring at York, just as it would have set a “bad example” for the government to allow gains for public sector workers in a time of austerity. At York and elsewhere, the casualization of academic labour – marked by the increasing use of contract faculty in university teaching – is one of the most important aspects of the corporatization of the university. It is a process that Benjamin Johnson (2003: 62) has characterized as the “rot at the heart of the new corporate university

system.” Not only has the transformation of academic labour had significant consequences for university employees, it has undermined collegial governance, threatened academic freedom and eroded the educational mission of Canadian universities.

Defining Contract Faculty

Many terms have been used to describe this growing segment of academics who work off the tenure track, including adjuncts, part-timers, sessionals, limited-term employees, lecturers, stipendiaries, migrant workers, contingent workers, “hidden” or invisible academics, the academic “underclass” and intellectual proletariat. Some have even used the phrases “freeway flyers” and “road scholars” to refer to workers who string together several positions at multiple institutions (Rajagopal 2002; Gappa and Leslie 1993). There are also several different kinds of contract appointments. Most contracts fall within the category of part-time work; however, they can also include full-time, limited-term positions. Regardless of these nuances, there are some commonalities about contract work in the university and how it differs from that of permanent faculty. Whereas tenured and tenure track academics are expected to perform the full range of academic activities – including teaching, research and service – contract instructors are hired solely to carry out teaching duties. Their contracts begin and end with the courses they are appointed to teach. This limited job description means that, unlike their tenured counterparts, contract faculty are typically excluded from university governance. Moreover, their salaries are usually a fraction of those earned per course by tenured professors and their benefits are often limited or non-existent, despite the fact that they may have been employed by the same institution for long periods of time.

Contract faculty differ from one another in many ways, including their life circumstances, level of education, career aspirations, motivations for teaching, and employment status outside the university. Indhu Rajagopal (2002) distinguishes between two main groups of contract faculty: “classics” and “contemporaries,” each of which has a fundamentally different role within the academy. Classics typically have full-time careers outside of academia, in areas such as education, social work, business, dentistry, law or medicine. For this reason, they may find the conditions of part-time academic work acceptable or even desirable. These hires have been important to universities since their inception, as they provide specialized expertise and connections to new advances in professional fields. Some universities offer clinical and other professional practitioners positions such as “Professor of Practice” (sometimes with tenure), many of whom are expected to conduct “creative professional activity” rather than research (University of Toronto 2004).⁷⁷ Classics, however, are the exception rather than the rule. Most contract academics are not well-paid professionals, but are contemporaries – individuals who usually teach core courses rather than narrow specialties and whose livelihoods are dependent on part-time teaching. Contemporaries comprise a greater proportion of teaching staff in Canadian universities and, relative to their numbers, provide a higher proportion of the courses taught. This group also contains a higher proportion of scholars who desire a full-time academic career. Although both groups of contract faculty may value teaching, the practicing professional who teaches courses as part of their personal or professional life is very different than the aspiring academic who teaches multiple

⁷⁷ Sometimes “classic” hires have a high social standing. In 2010, for example, former head of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, Tom D’Aquino, assumed an academic appointment in the Norman Patterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University.

courses at substandard wages as a means of earning a living. Overall, then, classics can generally be thought of as “willing” part-timers, while contemporaries are the “real” part-time faculty within the university (Rajagopal 2002: 131, 150).

The increasing use of contract workers in Canadian universities also has distinct gender and racial dimensions. In her work, Linda Muzzin (2008) demonstrates that contract employees are disproportionately women and persons from ethno-racial minority groups, thereby undermining progress in addressing issues of gender and racial equity in the academy. Previous research supports Muzzin’s finding that women are over-represented among contingent faculty, particularly in relation to the proportion of women in higher academic ranks (Bauder 2006; Breslauer 1985; CAUT 2006; Omiecinski 2003; Rajagopal 2002; Rajagopal and Farr 1992). More recent research also confirms this trend; a 2012 report by the Council of Canadian Academies (2012a) found that women remain significantly under-represented within Canada’s highest academic ranks and that women occupy a much higher proportion of contract faculty.⁷⁸ Related to this, Rajagopal (2002) found that women part-timers makes less money, are more likely to derive a greater share of their income from contract work and are less likely to have outside employment than men. In part, then, these inequities can be attributed to the fact that women are more likely to be contemporary contract workers.

In addition to differences amongst contract labourers, there are also differences between faculties and departments in their use of contract labour. Narrow professional

⁷⁸ There has been some improvement in women’s representation within the academy. For example, the proportion of full-time female teachers holding tenured positions more than doubled between 1989 and 2009, to over 30 percent (CAUT 2012a). However, women remain under-paid and under-represented in relation to their male colleagues. Male professors earn higher salaries on average and this discrepancy is over \$20,000 at some universities (Cross 2010). In terms of representation, women account for approximately one out of five full professors and one out of three professors at the associate level (AAUC 2007a; CAUT 2010b).

disciplines such as law or business are often in a better position to hire practice-based specialists from the community (classics) to mitigate budget cuts or fill gaps left by permanent faculty on leave. However, this option is not as readily available for the humanities and social sciences, which rely on contemporaries to a greater extent.⁷⁹ Muzzin's (2008) study of contingent faculty highlights this differential impact of university restructuring across disciplines. Contrasting sociology and anthropology departments with those of law, she shows how law has been insulated from the effects of restructuring and contingent employment through its reliance on outside legal specialists.⁸⁰

Despite the diverse characteristics of contract employees, including who they are and where they are most likely to be employed, the defining characteristic that unites them is their limited-term contract. In the following sections, I use the term contract faculty as a generic descriptor to refer to non-tenured and non-tenure track academic staff in Canadian universities. I am primarily interested in the large and growing number of contemporaries who do not have careers outside of academia, who desire full-time academic employment, and who rely on contract teaching as their chief source of income.

Documenting the Rise in Contract Faculty

Contract teaching is not a new phenomenon. The increase in these kinds of academic appointments is the result of a longstanding transformation of academic labour that began in the 1970s. But these appointments generally served a different purpose in the past than

⁷⁹ According to Statistics Canada, doctoral graduates in the humanities are far more likely to desire a full-time university position compared with graduates in other disciplines (Desjardins 2012). In Ontario, for example, 65 percent of all doctoral graduates pursued their degree with the intention of becoming university professors. In the humanities, this figure was 86 percent.

⁸⁰ Theresa Shanahan (2008) has also examined the discipline of law within the context of corporatization. She found that the discipline's professional status and its connections to a wealthy profession have insulated legal scholarship (at the University of British Columbia at least) from commercializing pressures.

they do today. Newson and Buchbinder (1988) explain that during the expansion phase of higher education in the 1960s, limited-term appointments usually functioned as stepping-stones to permanent academic jobs. Furthermore, contract appointments were generally beneficial for both the university and instructor. They allowed academic departments the opportunity to evaluate new recruits before offering them a tenure track position, and they offered young scholars teaching and other valuable academic experience prior to assuming a full-time job. This situation changed with the onset of fiscal restraint in the 1970s. During this period, the academic job market shifted in the direction of intermittent, part-time positions. Rather than replace vacated spots previously held by tenured faculty, large numbers of contract academics were hired on a course-by-course basis in order to reduce costs. Universities justified substandard wages and meager benefits by limiting employment responsibilities to instruction, with no “requirements” (and therefore no support) to conduct research or provide service to the institution.

The nature and extent of this transformation in North America has been variously documented, with there being much more detailed data available on changes in the US context. Focusing on the US specifically, research suggests that between 1976 and 2007, the number of part-time faculty increased by 264 percent, while the number of full-time non-tenure track faculty rose by 211 percent. In contrast, the increase in tenured and tenure track faculty was just 28 percent and 7 percent respectively (AAUP 2010). By the late 2000s, less than one third of US faculty were tenured or tenure track. If graduate students working as contract instructors are included in the analysis, the proportion of US academics occupying tenure stream positions is closer to 25 percent. Joe Berry (2005: 4) argues that the casualization of the faculty workforce in the US “represents one of the

few instances in the US economy (another is taxi driving) where an entire occupation has been converted from permanent career status to temporary, often part-time, status in the space of a single generation of workers.” Indeed, a “two-tiered” professoriate has emerged in the US, where a minority of professors in the top tier are well compensated, enjoy considerable job security, control their own work and occupy what Stanley Aronowitz (2001) once described as “the last good job in America.” In contrast, the more than two-thirds of academics in the bottom tier “are poorly paid, without benefits or pensions, denied support or time to do research or service, have little control of what they teach and little or no voice in curriculum decisions or academic governance. Most even lack an office, and academic freedom, if it is available at all, lasts only until their contract expires” (Turk 2008b: 298-299).

Documenting the increasing use of contract faculty in Canada is more difficult. The AUCC (2007a) recently confirmed this data gap, noting in a report that, unlike the US, where the use of part-time faculty is increasing, there is no reliable data with which to assess the use of part-time faculty in Canadian universities. While the next chapter addresses this data gap by documenting the rise of contract faculty in Ontario specifically, historical data suggests that the number of part-timers hired and their ratio to permanent faculty increased significantly in Ontario from the mid-1970s through the 1980s (Rajagopal 2002). Similarly, in Quebec there were almost as many contract instructors (or *chargés de cours*) as there were permanent faculty by the end of the 1980s, although a significant number were of the “classic” variety (Cameron 1991). While data on the rest of Canada is limited at best, the available information suggests that there has been a lesser degree of casualization here than in the US. This difference has been

attributed to a stronger legislative base for collective bargaining, greater academic unionization and the specific efforts of professional organizations like the CAUT.

The transformation of academic work did not go unnoticed in Canada. As early as 1976, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations and the Council of Ontario Universities were criticizing their memberships for “turning increasingly toward term appointments” in an effort to reduce costs (cited in Axelrod 1982a: 187). They noted the “extreme case” of one university that had announced its intention to have 40 percent of its faculty in non-tenurable positions. Other universities, they said, “are pursuing similar, if less Draconian objectives.” In the opinion of both organizations, the increasing reliance on contract faculty was creating “second-class citizens of the university community [who are] unable to participate fully in various aspects of its life and work or to plan their lives and careers with reasonable hope.” Some years later in Quebec, the Conseil des universités also expressed concerns about the excessive use of part-time faculty, especially the most vulnerable segment of workers who were dependent on year-to-year contracts at multiple institutions (Cameron 1991).

The Influence of Administrators and Wider Market Forces

Throughout the transformation of academic labour, it has been well understood that administrators have played a significant role. In the early years, administrators were seen to be leading the charge largely because of the cost-cutting benefits associated with an increasing reliance on contract staff. For one, the salaries of these workers represent a fraction of the money earned per course by tenure stream professors. By 1987-88, for example, the salaries of part-timers amounted to just 7.6 percent of Ontario university salary expenditures, even though they comprised 32.4 percent of all faculty and

performed one fifth of the teaching (Rajagopal and Farr 1992). Other cost savings accrue as a result of the fact that these workers are generally not eligible for benefits (e.g., sick leave and parental leave) and there is little obligation on the part of employers to provide them with the support services typically provided for permanent faculty. For these reasons, the increased use of contract faculty was considered necessary to maintain revenues from enrollment growth and a politically acceptable ratio of students to faculty, as well as provide a “cost-effective” means of testing new programs.

While the motivation to cut costs is relatively uncontested, there is less consensus about the extent to which the accelerated use of contract employment represented a deliberate management strategy to impose labour flexibility and increase the power of administrators. I would argue, however, that these trends were indeed connected to a conscious, longer-term strategy to transform the nature of academic work. Writing about the current period, Harald Bauder (2006) supports this contention and argues that casualization has become a fixed and deliberate strategy of reducing wages and working conditions in the academic labour market. This change has taken hold because contract positions are increasingly being created where tenure stream positions can and should exist. In other words, labour market segmentation in the academy “no longer serves to stabilize the positions of tenured faculty; rather, the secondary segment threatens to replace the primary segment” (p. 231). This shift runs parallel to developments in the larger economy, where neoliberal campaigns have led to more labour flexibility and a situation where the number of part-time and temporary workers is growing beyond what is necessary to fill temporary labour needs. Like Bauder, Marc Bousquet (2008) sees little evidence that the transformation of academic labour is driven by the “invisible hand” of

the market. For example, while market theory assumes that universities *want* to hire more permanent faculty and that they *will* hire these faculty when they can afford to do so, the reality is that permanent positions are being systematically reduced. Again, this is evidenced by the fact that the jobs of retiring professors are often not replaced by tenure track appointments.⁸¹ At the same time, the low pay and lack of benefits that come with these jobs are usually justified by the claim that it is ultimately market forces – not management decisions – that determine compensation rates. So, like the wider process of labour market restructuring, the transformation of academic labour has come to embody the erosion of key rights obtained by workers through decades of labour organizing.

Just as the practice of relying on contract faculty has been challenged, so too has the claim that the change is an inevitable result of market forces. Academics should not accept the fallacious notion that universities are simply responding to the market’s “demand” for their labour; universities are not over-producing PhDs, they are under-producing quality jobs. For decades, Bousquet (2008: 205-206) writes, free market ideology has “proceeded to do the corporate university the enormous service of covering up the processes of corporatization, managerialism, and casualization.” Although they rarely say so publicly, administrators cannot fail to recognize that an insecure reserve army of part-time workers performs many of the same functions in the academy that it does in the broader workforce, namely, to divide workers, to reduce their power relative to management and to make workplace organizing more difficult. Linda Pratt (1997: 269-270) insists that the exploitation of part-time faculty has been a deliberate management

⁸¹ Recently at the University of Calgary senior faculty were offered a one-time buyout, with no guarantee that any of their positions would be replaced. According to the administration, such a commitment would have reduced managerial flexibility (Cooper 2012).

strategy. In her words: “Exploitative employment situations are bad enough when they are an unfortunate but necessary budget restriction. Exploitative employment practices as a tactic to redesign – or ‘re-engineer’ – the academy are worse because they coolly calculate the use the institution can make of the economic desperation and despairing ambitions of its potential workers.” Considering their central importance to the ongoing restructuring process, maintaining a large segment of highly skilled, “just-in-time” workers is a key priority for the corporatizing university.

The Conditions of Precarious Employment

Several years ago, the AUCC (2007a) produced a report on university faculty in Canada, including past and present hiring practices, changes in demographics and salaries, key “drivers of change” and future projections. Interestingly, the document lacks any real attention to contract faculty. Further, there is no acknowledgement in the report of the diverse challenges and hardships experienced by these employees. In fact, according to the AUCC, part-time academic work benefits employees, students and universities alike. The document states, for example, that part-time positions “provide both the employer and the employee with an opportunity to determine if each is suited to the other” (p. 24). In other words, these positions offer a testing ground for institutional fit or as precursors to tenure track jobs. While this may have been true half a century ago, it bears little reality in the corporatized academy. The preponderance of errors and omissions in the AUCC’s discussion of part-time faculty is notable, but is not surprising given that the organization’s 13-member board of directors includes 12 university presidents. Canadian senior administrators have every interest in downplaying the precarious nature of contract employment. Drawing on the CAUT’s (2010a) *Policy Statement of Fairness for Contract*

Academic Staff as a guide, in this section I examine what we know about the employment status and working conditions of contract academics. This statement includes a series of guidelines meant to ensure fair and equitable treatment of contract faculty. Several of these guidelines are reproduced in italics, followed by brief accompanying analysis.

(i) Integrated Scholarship: *All academic appointments should recognize that the nature of academic work includes teaching, research and professional activity and participation in service activities.*

Most contract faculty desire a full academic career. A major survey of contingent faculty in the US, for example, found that over three quarters of part-time instructors said they “have sought, are now seeking, or will be seeking a full-time tenure-track position,” and a similar proportion indicated they would definitely or probably accept such a position if it were offered (Coalition on the Academic Workforce 2012). As previously noted, however, whereas tenure stream faculty are expected to perform the full range of academic activities, contract instructors are hired solely to carry out teaching duties. In contrast to the above guideline, limited-term contracts rarely recognize the research and service components of academic work or provide these employees with appropriate resources and protections to participate in a full academic career. As a result, contract workers often do not have the time or the financial security to engage in sustained research and other collegial responsibilities, which diminishes their ability to obtain permanent positions in the future. It is also difficult for these workers to engage in integrated scholarship when their work appointments vary from year to year, or even term to term. “Freeway fliers,” who combine two or more part-time jobs at different institutions, are especially vulnerable in this regard. The use of contract appointments

undermines the research and service components of academic work and amounts to a process of academic deskilling.

(ii) Academic Governance: *The right of contract academic staff to participate in academic governance must be recognized and protected. Contract academic staff must be appropriately remunerated for service work.*

Contract faculty are generally not required, and usually not encouraged, to participate in university governance. In fact, they are often excluded from even the most basic decision-making bodies, such as departmental committees. In contrast to permanent faculty in Canada, who report having a substantial degree of input and influence over academic decisions at the department level, contract faculty have little or no input into teaching/curriculum priorities and other aspects of workplace management (Jones et al. 2012). The lack of participation of contract staff in academic governance impacts the entire professoriate. It decreases faculty control over the curriculum by allowing administrators more power over its design and priorities. It can also adversely affect the teaching and research commitments of permanent staff because they are assigned all or most of the responsibilities of academic service (e.g., program reviews, accreditation exercises, student supervision and committee work).⁸² In short, most contract instructors have little say in how their departments are run. Even if they do, faculty governance is weakened by constant employee turnover.

(iii) Salaries and Benefits: *Contract academic staff have a right to fair remuneration commensurate with their experience, performance and*

⁸² One survey found that of those faculty who perceived their workload to have increased over the past five years, the lack of replacement for retiring/departing faculty was one of the primary reasons (OCUFA 2012b). Presumably, the responsibility of increased service requirements was one of the underlying factors.

responsibilities ... Compensation for contract academic staff should be pro-rated to the total compensation, including benefit programmes, for a full-time position having similar responsibilities and requiring similar qualifications.

According to the *Toronto Star*, full-time tenured faculty in Canada are, on average, the highest paid in the world (Brown 2012a). This is in spite of the fact that expenditures on academic rank salaries have fallen in the last three decades, from over 30 percent of university expenditures in 1980 to 20 percent in 2009 (CAUT 2012a). Of course, Canada's international ranking could be different if the large number of underpaid, part-time instructors were taken into account. Given their level of education and despite significant provincial variation,⁸³ contract faculty are generally paid very poorly. Even if you remove non-teaching work from faculty salaries and only consider teaching, the pay of most contract staff remains well below other professors (Smallman 2004).⁸⁴ Presumably, the low wages of contract faculty is one reason why Statistics Canada's 2007 *National Graduates Survey* found that earning a PhD does little to boost earnings compared with master's degree graduates (Fine 2009a).⁸⁵

⁸³ For example, chargés de cours in Quebec appear to be paid considerably more than contract faculty in most other Canadian provinces and universities. At the University of Sherbrooke, instructors are paid between \$15,452 and \$19,206 for two three-credit courses. At the University of Montreal, they are paid \$16,776 per two-term course. In contrast, instructors at the University of Prince Edward Island receive between \$10,248 and \$10,778 for two half-year courses; at Dalhousie they receive between \$9,131 and \$11,166 per full-year course; while those at the University of Winnipeg receive just \$7,556 for a full-year course (MacDonald 2013). Generally speaking, employee benefits for contract faculty in Quebec are also more generous.

⁸⁴ One of the main gaps in the literature in this area is a national study of the wages of contract instructors. Among other benefits, these data would help to assess whether university administrators' desire for "flexibility" is important enough that they would continue to employ large numbers of part-time faculty even in instances when their wages approached those of tenured professors.

⁸⁵ More specifically, two years after leaving university individuals with a doctorate earned on average just \$5,000 more (\$65,000/year) than those with a Master's degree (\$60,000/year). The survey also found that PhD graduates were less likely than Master's graduates to have obtained full-time employment over the same time period.

As Canadian universities continue to progress towards a US-style two-tiered academic workforce, one can expect that the number of contract faculty relying on social assistance will increase. In the US, between 2007 and 2010, the number of people with PhD's who received food stamps and other aid nearly tripled. Representatives of US contract faculty contend that these figures underestimate the actual numbers because many academics do not report their reliance on federal aid (Patton 2012). A recent survey of US contract faculty supports these findings. The survey found that that a “surprisingly large number” of instructors were “living in poverty” and identified “terrible pay” as a major problem in their lives (Street et al. 2012: 13). Similarly, pensions and benefits – including sick leave, parental leave, health and disability insurance, vision and dental care – are often not available to contract faculty, even though they may be employed by the same institution(s) for a considerable period of time (MacDonald 2013). The lack of benefits is especially unjust for those who work at multiple institutions, as each university considers them to be “part-time” even though they are full-time employees in the university system. The recent changes to employment insurance rules that came into effect in Canada in 2013 will only make it more difficult for contract employees to apply for and receive the benefits that many of them rely on during the summer months.

(iv) Working Conditions and Institutional Support: *Employers should provide contract academic staff with the resources and equipment necessary to perform their professional duties at a proportionate level of Regular Academic Staff ... Contract academic staff must have fair and equitable access to professional development opportunities at a proportionate level of Regular Academic Staff.*

While most universities provide some institutional supports for contract faculty, there is little *obligation* on the part of universities to provide these workers with basic services that permanent faculty take for granted. These can include access to library resources, photocopying, computers, email, clerical support, telephones, mailboxes and office space (Street et al. 2012).⁸⁶ Even when contract faculty do acquire office space, it is often shared and overcrowded and therefore insufficiently private to meet the needs of students. Indeed, some universities appear reluctant to grant anything that would suggest that contract workers are part of the university community, that they have the right to expect reappointment, or that they should consider themselves to be “faculty.” For example, in a recent round of contract negotiations between Dalhousie University and CUPE 3912, the university asserted that it was not appropriate for part-timers to claim affiliation with Dalhousie when seeking publication (Kennedy 2010).

Another consequence of this lack of support is that contract instructors are routinely denied access to faculty development programs, including training in pedagogy. Limiting professional enrichment activities to permanent faculty is not only unjust but it threatens the quality of academic programs in which part-timers do most of the teaching. Substandard working conditions and a lack of professional support reduces the status of contract workers to second-class citizens within the university. As well, the “just in time” approach to contract hiring means that instructors often receive their course assignments just days or weeks before courses begin. They therefore suffer the “double contingency” of either “using their own unpaid time to prepare for classes they may not be assigned or

⁸⁶ Sometimes these supports are conditional. For instance, contract faculty at Dalhousie are eligible for library cards and email following a probationary period of employment. At McMaster, the university policy is that “best efforts” should be made to provide instructors with services such as photocopying, audio-visual equipment and telephones (MacDonald 2013).

accepting the reality of teaching a course for which they have been unable to adequately prepare” (Street et al. 2012: iii).

(v) Academic Freedom and Job Security: *Academic freedom extends to all academic staff regardless of the nature of the appointment. Academic freedom for contract academic staff should be respected in all matters of personnel management including, but not limited to, posting positions, search procedures, hiring decisions, performance assessments, renewals of contract, tenure, promotion and discipline.*

Although not a guarantee against censor or dismissal, the protections of tenure continue to provide a substantial degree of academic freedom for permanent faculty. In fact, the widespread adoption of collective bargaining by faculty associations has resulted in Canada having some of the best protections for academic freedom in the world. While it remains difficult (though by no means impossible) to dismiss tenured faculty for their teaching, research or political views, the same cannot be said for the large number of contract faculty currently working in Canadian universities.

Contract employees have little to no job security. Most of these employees must apply for their jobs as often as every few months, and they have no guarantee of reappointment. Those who are fortunate enough to be assigned courses for multiple terms are vulnerable to changes in enrollment trends. For the growing cadre of mostly part-time workers, there also continues to be limited protections from colleagues, administrators, politicians and even students who may be offended by what they say or write. Many contract staff can be dismissed from their positions without the right to appeal or due process and without administrators even having to provide a reason. In the absence of job

security, controversial positions or provocative statements can easily result in a contract not being renewed. This creates a powerful disincentive to refrain from engaging with controversial material inside and outside of the classroom.⁸⁷

Any university in which the fear of taking risks hampers the free exchange of ideas or the exploration of experimental pedagogies is a diminished institution. The silent self-censorship of thousands of professors holding insecure appointments has had a detrimental impact on the academy. More generally, the vulnerability of contract faculty has contributed to “a large pool of crippling fear, insecurity, and resentment that makes it difficult for teachers to take risks, forge bonds of solidarity, engage in social criticism, and perform as public intellectuals rather than as technicians in the service of corporate largesse” (Giroux 2003). This reality represents a significant victory for those who want to silence dissent and activism emanating from the university. The particularly precarious position of contract faculty also highlights a critical (and often overlooked) dimension of academic freedom that is threatened by corporatization, which is the right of faculty as a collectivity to exercise sovereignty over the educational process and govern their institutions in a manner that accords with academic values.

(vi) Rank, Status and Power: *All academic staff, regardless of their employment status, should hold an appropriate academic rank commensurate with their experience and/or responsibilities.*

⁸⁷ There are numerous examples of contract faculty being terminated for unpopular utterances. In 2010, Daniel Peterson, a philosophy lecturer at the University of Hawaii, was dismissed from his position for using the phrase “shit happens” during one of his lectures (Jaschik 2010). Evidently, Mr. Peterson was attempting to illustrate concepts such as free will and determinism to his philosophy students. A parent filed a complaint with the university and Mr. Peterson was suspended and eventually resigned after refusing the university’s demands that he censor himself and alter his teaching practices.

Even though they may accumulate years – or even decades – of teaching service, many universities will not consider contract faculty for promotion to higher academic ranks (let alone tenure). The nature of contract work also makes organizing difficult so these workers are often in a poor position to bargain for increased wages, benefits and job security. Once again, the precarious nature of contract employment even extends to the tenuous hold these workers have over their status as “faculty,” which is often questioned by administrators and, in some instances, their tenured colleagues.⁸⁸ Contingent employment also limits professional opportunities. According to Berry (2005: 10), research demonstrates that longtime contract instructors are seen as “damaged goods” by hiring committees. In other words, their teaching experience and commitment to the profession act as a detriment, increasing with the number of years on the job. Given their lack of power and diminished academic status, it is not surprising that “contract academic staff are paying a heavy price with health issues and stress” (Stewart 2010). In contrast, permanent faculty in Canada report some of the highest levels of job satisfaction in the world (Jones et al. 2012; Tamburri 2012).

One final indication of the marginal status of contract faculty is their invisibility. Referring again to the CAUT’s *Policy Statement of Fairness for Contract Academic Staff*, it states that: “Up-to-date personnel records should be kept on each employee.” A common theme in the literature and something I discovered in my own research on contract faculty in Ontario is that many universities do not keep systematic records of

⁸⁸ It should be noted that these kinds of vulnerabilities are not restricted to part-timers. In her study, Rajagopal (2004) found that three-quarters of full-time contract staff represented by a union or faculty association believed that these organizations were powerless in voicing their concerns and half felt unprotected against arbitrary treatment by administrators. Moreover, two thirds believed they were hired principally to keep instructional costs down (for faculty in the social sciences and humanities, this figure was significantly higher) and nearly three quarters agreed that finance, not academic quality, was the driving force behind university policies.

their contract employees, further devaluing this segment of the academic workforce.⁸⁹ Indeed, “hidden academics” and “invisible faculty” are not simply catchphrases – they often describe their employment situations in literal terms.

Impacts on Students and Student Learning

Contract instructors are not inherently bad teachers. Their enthusiasm and ability to facilitate student learning, and even their knowledge of the subject matter, often exceeds that of permanent professors. Nevertheless, a growing body of evidence suggests that academic casualization negatively impacts students. The reasons for this have to do with the precariousness nature of contract employment, which results in barriers and disincentives to quality teaching on the part of contract faculty. Put another way, poor teaching conditions lead to poor learning conditions. If contract faculty do excel at teaching, it is usually in spite of their employment circumstances.

Academic casualization has both direct and indirect impacts on students. The direct impacts stem largely from the fact that substandard pay often forces casual employees to teach multiple courses at a time, sometimes at different institutions. As a result, many are overburdened by heavy teaching loads, and have little time for the writing and research necessary to keep up with their fields. Such a system offers little room for professional growth and development, which means that students of contract instructors are not always exposed to new advances in the field. Likewise, many contract instructors have less time for class preparation and student evaluation than full-time faculty with lesser

⁸⁹ In addition to a lack of record keeping, Giroux (2010) adds that administrators can render contract faculty invisible by farming out their employment to temporary services agencies. Defending the practice, one administrator claimed that these workers occupy the same status as clerical workers and therefore should be hired by a temp agency. Commenting on the incident, Giroux stated that “[r]educing faculty with doctorates to the status of clerical workers surely is a mode of governance that is blinded by its own power and arrogance” (p. 3).

teaching loads. For this reason, they may be more likely to use standardized methods of assessment, such as multiple choice exams. For example, one study found that contract instructors are 50 percent less likely to require essay exams than full-time faculty (Moser 2001). Similarly, the AAUP (2003) found that full-time faculty in the US spend between 50 to 100 percent more time per credit hour on instruction than do part-time teachers. Moreover, a recent study by the Center for the Future of Higher Education (2012) confirms that the “just in time” approach to contract hiring is detrimental for students because it is associated with “insufficient preparation time, insufficient time to incorporate and update meaningful material for students, and insufficient time to explore pedagogical methods and materials” (Street et al. 2012: 7). The study also showed that limited access to pedagogical resources compromised the ability of contract faculty to educate their students.

The job insecurity and lack of academic freedom inherent in contract work often translates, indirectly, into impediments to student learning. Contract instructors are evaluated solely in terms of their teaching, which means that student evaluations can make the difference between being renewed or being unemployed. In this context, teachers are under pressure to “keep their customers happy” (Puplampu 2004: 177). There are also incentives to refrain from teaching in a critical or challenging manner and experimenting with innovative forms of pedagogy. Michelle Weber (2008: 48) has shown, for instance, that contingent faculty in Canada experience pressure to water down the feminist content of their courses and “pander to the perceived conservatism” of their students in order to remain uncontroversial. Casual employment also impacts the student-professor relationship in other ways. Patrick Deane, president of McMaster University,

attributes today's "crisis in higher education" to the inability of universities to provide "meaningful contact with accessible professors" (cited in Bradshaw 2011). Although Deane does not explicitly connect this observation to contract work, this lack of contact is rooted – at least in part – in the casualization of academic employment. The demanding schedules of contract faculty often do not permit them to hold office hours; one study in the US found an 11-1 disparity between full-time and part-time faculty in their probability of keeping no office hours (Benjamin 2003). This study also found that contract faculty are less able to provide prompt feedback on assigned work, and discuss course materials and ideas outside the classroom. Similarly, Paul Umbach (2007) found that compared with their tenure stream colleagues, part-time faculty interact with students less frequently, spend less time preparing for class, use active or collaborative teaching techniques less often and have lower academic expectations.⁹⁰ This lack of interaction is significant, given what we know about the positive outcomes associated with contact between professors and students. These outcomes include improved academic performance, increased cognitive and affective development and a greater degree of satisfaction with the educational experience (Jaeger 2008).

Research suggests that contract employment also impacts student persistence and degree completion. Audrey Jaeger (2008) discovered that attrition rates increase for students who take courses with contract faculty. First-year students, for example, were far less likely to persist into their second year after being exposed to part-time faculty in

⁹⁰ Many of these outcomes related to the corporatization process are not wholly restricted to contract faculty. For example, full-time faculty also report making changes to their teaching and pedagogy in response to increasing workload pressures. These changes include a greater use of multiple choice tests, fewer writing assignments and a reduction in the amount of time spent with students outside of class (e.g., OCUFA 2012b).

introductory “gatekeeper” courses. Jaeger also found that exposure to contract faculty reduced the likelihood of student graduation (see also Ehrenberg and Zhang 2005; Jacoby 2006; Jaeger and Eagan 2009, 2010; Schibik and Harrington 2002). Like many researchers, Jaeger argues that the negative effects on student persistence are attributable to the pressures and challenges of contract work, especially reduced student-professor interaction.

Understanding the challenges inherent in contract employment and the range of potential impacts on students, it is interesting to note what drives contract instructors to teach. In her survey of Canadian part-timers, Rajagopal (2002: 110) found that the two most important reasons given for teaching (by an overwhelming margin) were personal satisfaction and the enjoyment associated with student contact. In spite of structural obstacles, many contract staff also report doing additional unpaid work to meet their students’ needs and protect them from the effects of academic contingency (Street et al. 2012). As the authors note:

While intensely aware of their own ‘second-class’ status and its potential negative effects on students, many respondents expressed a desire to protect their students from the effects of their employment situations even when doing so entailed considerable personal cost. A surprisingly large number of respondents spoke of ‘living in poverty’ and identified terrible pay as a significant problem. Nevertheless, respondents also reported spending their own money – on copies, on personal computers, software, and more – to provide and ensure their students receive a quality educational experience (p. 13).

Before concluding this section, it is also interesting to reflect on the location of contract instructors in the context of broader university ideals and principles. For one, the reliance on contract faculty suggests to students that teaching and learning are activities unworthy of public and institutional support. It also suggests that although universities

pay lip service to equality, fairness and other high ideals, exploitation is acceptable if it leads to economic benefits. According to Barbara Ehrenreich (1997: xi), the casualization of academic labour encourages students to believe that “some lives are valued a lot more than others ... this is what students learn in a place that purports to teach the world’s most noble philosophical traditions, that teaches the humanities while ignoring the humanity of its own employees and part of its teaching staff.”

The Role of Permanent Faculty

Some contend that tenured and tenure track professors are largely oblivious to the scope and significance of the casualization process (Rhoades 1998), while others argue that they are a primary cause of the problem. In Canada, Indhu Rajagopal has been one of the strongest critics of the full-time faculty role. In the 1980s, Rajagopal and Farr (1989) argued that senior professors functioned as “gatekeepers” in the academy, and adopted a “decidedly non-collegial, managerial stance toward part-time academic employees” (p. 268, 276). This authority role accentuated the academic hierarchy and reduced the potential for solidarity between academic ranks. In 2002, Rajagopal presented survey evidence showing that most full professors favour a separate teaching stream for part-timers, and believe that collegial decision-making should be an exclusive tenure track right and that universities are under no obligation to offer permanent positions to long serving, part-time employees. In short, according to Rajagopal, most permanent faculty (especially full professors) do not regard contract workers as full members of the academy. These attitudes are apparently not lost on contract workers themselves. A large number of them recognize – or at least believe – that full-timers view them as

subordinates with a limited academic role (Rajagopal 2002, 2004).⁹¹ Many also think that the abolition of tenure would improve the quality of higher education, likely because the tenure system is seen by many lower-tier academics as a “pernicious hierarchy within the profession itself, one that gives inordinate power to senior professors” (Johnson 2003: 79).

In Canada, this separation between permanent and contract faculty may be compounded by the fact that contract workers are often represented by different unions. Some even suggest that unionization has had a counter-intuitive effect of increasing casualization. Dobbie and Robinson (2008), for example, note a positive correlation across provinces between faculty unionization and reliance on part-time workers. They suggest that this trend could be a result of union preoccupation with the needs of permanent staff, which has its roots in the fact that most unions were founded in the 1970s when the majority of members had tenure. According to the authors, this preoccupation continues so that the interests of contract faculty are not prioritized in negotiations, as full-timers “acquiesce in (or inadvertently encourage) the erosion of tenure track positions and the exploitation of contingent faculty” (p. 137).⁹² In Canada today, Alison Hearn (2010: 208) argues that there is a “deafening silence on the part of the tenured and tenure-streamed faculty about the segmentation of academic labour and the fate of contingent academic workers.”

⁹¹ Others point to more specific cases. Mike Burke and Joanne Naiman (2003), for example, focused on the role of the local union – the Ryerson Faculty Association – in helping to impose a two-tiered professoriate at Ryerson University.

⁹² At a more general level, Bousquet (2008: 79) argues that academic unionization movements across North America have been “inattentive to management’s stunningly successful installation of a casualized second tier.”

While it is true that the response of many permanent faculty to the issue of casualization has been less than admirable, it would be a mistake to hold permanent faculty responsible for academic contingency. First, it is administrators, not professors, that primarily control the kinds of positions that are allocated and budgeted for, and this type of managerial control has increased under corporatization. Second, these divisions between full-time and contract staff do not translate into significant opportunities or benefits for tenured faculty. The growing reliance on contract academics is not necessary to protect tenure or the salaries of tenured professors, just as the wages and job security of tenured positions are not the cause of casualization. Again, these views reflect market myths. The market is not stratifying academic labour or pitting different streams of workers against each other in a zero-sum game. On the contrary, permanent positions are being systematically eliminated through deliberate management decisions facilitated by government funding cuts. Casualization reflects the failure on the part of governments and universities to provide *all* university employees with a decent living. It is the systematic bifurcation of the faculty into a two-tiered labour force – not tenure or the attitudes of senior staff – that is the root of the problem.

New Directions: Contracting Out?

An emerging trend in the context of understanding the use of contract faculty is the growth of private for-profit “educational” providers, such as Australian-based Navitas and its competitor Study Group International. Navitas is a transnational corporation that has operated in Canada since 2006 when it signed an agreement with Simon Fraser University. Two years later, the company signed another deal with the University of Manitoba. Although similar deals at other Canadian universities have fallen through in

recent years, many are still considering and actively negotiating educational partnerships with these and similar kinds of corporations. The partnership arrangements work as follows. Companies like Navitas establish a presence on a university campus in the form of an “international study centre,” which then recruits and educates international students for the university. The company provides the university with a share of the tuition revenue it receives in exchange for being allowed to use the university’s name and logo in its marketing campaigns. This means that the company is paying the university to use its publicly-subsidized brand. The recruited students – many of which would not have qualified for admission to the university – are provided with English-language training and other preparatory courses in various disciplines, and upon successfully completing the program, are guaranteed transfer to a regular university stream. For both the company and the university, the benefits of this partnership are primarily economic.

Companies like Navitas rely exclusively on contract teaching. The record of these private providers in the UK and elsewhere has raised serious questions about the quality of their academic programming. The record has also shown that the pay and working conditions of company instructors can be significantly worse than university instructors. In 2010, an external review of Simon Fraser’s contract with Navitas found that there was no provision for collective representation through an association or union, which further weakens the organizational capacity of contract faculty at SFU (CUPE 2010b). This lack of protection also ensures that Navitas instructors, even more so than regular contract staff, are virtually powerless in relation to their employers. Moreover, these “international study centres” can draw members away from organized bargaining units and into their non-unionized structures. There appears to be few quality controls over company hiring

practices, with universities essentially outsourcing or contracting out a portion of its hiring with no accountability. Taken together, the use of these companies in public universities represents another step towards a non-collegial, fee-for-service, contract teaching model.

Of course, the implications of having for-profit educational entities on Canadian campuses extend beyond the issue of academic labour. Allowing these firms to set up private preparatory schools under the auspices of trusted public institutions has set a dangerous precedent. In part, this is because the profit models of companies like Navitas demand continued expansion, and previous experience with Navitas has shown that it eventually does expand into other areas of university life. Many have criticized the motivations of these companies without recognizing that their very existence depends on the corporatization of the larger university system. In fact, Navitas' corporate strategy acknowledges that public funding reductions and the increasing reliance on full-fee paying international students are essential to its success. And like many partnership arrangements under corporatization, these deals are often implemented with little discussion or debate. A case in point was the University of Manitoba, where the university's 2008 deal with Navitas was essentially put into place through executive decree. In 2012, faculty at Manitoba received another surprise when it was announced that the presumed five year contract was actually a ten year deal expiring in 2018 (CAUT 2013b). Despite repeated efforts by the university senate (and even the CBC) to obtain details of the agreement through access to information requests, the university still refuses to disclose financial information about the arrangement. Given the threat that these "partnerships" pose to public universities, it is encouraging that faculty and student

resistance has forced many administrations – at McMaster, Dalhousie, Carleton, Windsor and elsewhere – to back away from these deals in recent years.

Concluding Remarks: A “Perfected System”

In principle, teaching is a rewarding occupation that offers a high level of intrinsic satisfaction. Given that most contract faculty are engaged in something they value and enjoy, some wonder why the casualization of academic labour should warrant so much concern. After all, contingent workers are found in other sectors of the economy, where working conditions are often significantly worse. What does it matter, then, if privileged young people are having trouble finding permanent jobs? To be sure, the level of exploitation is greater in other precarious occupations, and the inherent rewards of teaching may partly compensate for the otherwise poor conditions of contract work. That being said, there are a number of reasons why the situation of contract faculty is unique and, therefore, warrants specific attention. For one, in no other occupation is there such a wide disparity between groups whose jobs and training are so similar. For another, contract faculty in Canada have normally obtained – or are in the process of obtaining – a PhD. While the opportunity to pursue graduate education is a privilege in itself, these individuals are also delaying their earnings for years, if not decades, possibly in addition to accumulating high levels of student debt. Added to this is the fact that a considerable number of contingent academics have forgone the material rewards of state and corporate positions in the pursuit of social ideals. William Deresiewicz (2011) recently addressed this issue in *The Nation*. He writes:

Academia may once have been a cushy gig, but now we’re talking about highly talented young people who are willing to spend their 20s living on subsistence wages when they could be getting rich (and their friends *are*

getting rich), simply because they believe in knowledge, ideas, inquiry; in teaching, in following their passion. To leave more than half of them holding the bag at the end of it all, over 30 and having to scrounge for a new career, is a human tragedy.

Academics may also be uniquely suited to “tolerate” exploitation in the workplace.

The time, effort and money invested in a lengthy PhD program means that contract academics, in spite of the unjust nature of their appointments, are less likely to turn their backs on these investments and pursue different occupations. Further, Andrew Ross (2000) has suggested that like other creative professions, many academics willingly accept low wages in return for the opportunity to do what they love. For Ross, their readiness to accept the tradeoff of job satisfaction instead of a decent salary and job security is reflective of the sacrifices intellectual workers are conditioned to make. Following Ross’ work, Bousquet (2008: 63) contends that universities and governments have succeeded in associating academic work “with the ‘bohemian’ ideology that previously was reserved for artistic occupations,” whereby intellectuals accept not simply poor compensation but the “superexploitation of the artist, in part because the characteristics of casual employment . . . can so easily be associated with the popular understanding of normative rewards for ‘creative’ endeavor.” In other words, the sacrifices of contract staff are part of their dedication to the craft.

Compounding these problems is the fact that few professional sectors believe more strongly in meritocracy than intellectuals. For contract workers who are unable to find permanent positions, the idea that one’s talent is the ultimate determinant of one’s place in the occupational hierarchy has an especially demoralizing effect. Not only can it lead to feelings of inferiority but it reduces their ability to locate their precarious position

within the context of broader structural forces. The supposed academic meritocracy thus prolongs their exploitation by creating “a state of mind in which giving up hope signifies something far worse psychologically than a sensible change of careers” (Donoghue 2008: 63). All of these factors help to maintain the large supply of cheap labour and limit resistance.

Thus, contract faculty are a unique segment of contingent workers. They are willing to forgo material rewards and finance their own training through debt; they are often grateful for the opportunity to do what they love for inadequate compensation; they are able to be called upon and dismissed at will; and a significant portion readily internalize the structural inequalities of the academic hierarchy. For these reasons, Bousquet (2008: 71-72) describes the transformation of the academic work process as “a perfected system for recruiting, delivering, and ideologically reproducing an all-but-self-funding cadre of low-cost but highly trained ‘just-in-time’ labor power.” Little wonder, he says, that “every other transnational corporation wants to emulate the campus.”

To conclude, supporters of corporatization maintain that the greater utilization of contract faculty produces educational efficiencies because (i) it contains costs in tough economic times, and (ii) it offers managerial flexibility in the face of changing enrolment and student demand. Cost-cutting and institutional flexibility are not, in and of themselves, unreasonable objectives. Both of these practices have the potential to enhance efficiency in higher education. However, the claim that “efficiency” is produced through labour flexibility in the academy is unjustified. The displacement of secure, full-time professors with contract faculty may be highly efficient from an economic point of view, but it does not take into account the human, social and educational costs. For the

instructors, this practice is consistent with job insecurity and a more precarious working environment. For students, it often means reduced faculty-student interaction time and other impediments to learning. For tenured faculty, there are costs associated with increased demand for administrative service and, for the faculty as a whole, a weakening of collegial governance. The same logic can be used to counter the supposed efficiencies associated with practices like for-profit online education and larger class sizes.⁹³ In sum, there are huge ancillary costs associated with the growing reliance on contract appointments, so much so that the practice should be viewed as a “false economy” (Benjamin 2003: 93).

⁹³ In one of its recent publications, the Council of Ontario Universities (2011a) equates “efficiency gains” in higher education with “reduced teaching costs through larger class sizes” (p. 9, 11).

Chapter Five: Exposing the Transformation of Academic Labour through Access to Information Requests

As demonstrated in the last chapter, there continues to be a marked lack of data on the number of contract faculty working in Canadian universities. This kind of information remains unavailable – and, in some cases, hidden – despite a burgeoning literature on the precarious nature of contract employment and the threat it poses to teaching and learning, collegial governance, academic freedom and the integrity of the public university. There are three key reasons for this scarcity in data. First, there have been few academic studies on the topic, with the most detailed research to date – Indhu Rajagopal’s *Hidden Academics* (2002) – being limited to the 1990s.⁹⁴ Second, government cuts to organizations involved in generating educational statistics and analysis, including Statistics Canada, have compounded challenges in collecting and releasing these kinds of data. Third, and most importantly, universities have directly caused and contributed to the problem as many simply do not maintain detailed records of their contract employees and/or have been reluctant to release this information. One of the main contributions of my research is that I collected new data that allows us to begin to address this information gap in the Canadian context.

Obtaining employment data on contract faculty is not a new problem for researchers, in Canada or elsewhere. In 2010, researchers from 28 nations met in Moscow to compare information on academic salaries. Virtually all of the country studies pointed to a “dramatic increase in part-time contracts,” but most had no national data on the

⁹⁴ Rajagopal (2002) conducted national surveys on contract faculty as well as interviews with faculty and university administrators. Her data showed that part-time faculty constituted more than one third of all faculty in the early 1990s.

“number, profile or remuneration” of part-time employees on which to verify these claims. Thus, participants were “left to guess at what percentage of the teaching faculty is part-time, who they are, and how they are compensated” (Reisberg 2010).⁹⁵ Speaking of the Canadian context specifically, nearly three decades ago, Helen Breslauer (1985: 86) observed that university administrators were “unwilling or unable” to provide information on their contract instructors. In the 1990s, Rajagopal (2002: 206) found that three quarters of the administrators she surveyed did not believe it was “cost efficient” to collect data on part-timers, in part because they viewed them as temporary or transient workers. Over this same timeframe, Statistics Canada also attempted to gather these data through surveys on part-time faculty, but the research was compromised because a number of major universities chose not to complete the surveys. In fact, institutional coverage was 40 percent or less for most survey variables, which meant that the information was based on unreliable assumptions and estimates. Statistics Canada ultimately decided to suspend the part-time survey in 2001 (AUCC 2007a).⁹⁶ Later in the decade, Statistics Canada initiated one more major study on contract faculty. According to Philip Fine (2010a), there was a hope at the time that the organization was finally going to “solve the mystery as to how many part-time lecturers teach at the country’s

⁹⁵ That being said, researchers in some countries have documented the casualization of academic labour in detail. In Australia, for example, a recent study found that 60 percent of the academic workforce – or roughly 67,000 academics – were employed on a non-permanent or casual basis (Maslen 2010). In the US, the number of part-time faculty increased by 264 percent between 1976 and 2007, while the number of full-time non-tenure track faculty rose by 211 percent. In contrast, the increases in tenured and tenure track faculty were just 28 and 7 percent respectively (AAUP 2010).

⁹⁶ Statistics Canada continued its research in the early 2000s using the Labour Force Survey. One of their publications claims that the proportion of university faculty holding “non-permanent” positions doubled between 1999 and 2005, from 15.5 to 31.7 percent (Lin 2006). However, questions have been raised about the reliability of these data, especially in light of the author’s dubious conclusion that the rise in non-permanent employment is attributable to the growing proportion of older and retired professors working part-time on a voluntary basis.

universities. The statistic had been difficult to attain because many universities were holding tightly to the potentially embarrassing information.” However, the proposed study was never completed due to a purported lack of funds.

Indicative of the lack of research on this topic in Canada is that the most recent empirical work comes from an unpublished Master’s of Arts thesis (Bauer 2011) and US scholars (Dobbie and Robinson 2008). Focusing exclusively on Quebec, Louise Bauer (2011) found that the number of sessional academics – or *chargés de cours* – increased significantly in relation to permanent faculty between 1998 and 2008. Bauer’s data fits with Martin Finkelstein’s (2007) assertion that Quebec universities rely heavily on part-time faculty. Anecdotal evidence suggests it is common to have more than 50 percent of undergraduate teaching in Quebec universities assigned to contract faculty. At some institutions – such as the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM) – this figure may be as high as 70 percent (Mandel 2009).⁹⁷ Looking at all provinces outside of Quebec, David Dobbie and Ian Robinson (2008) have argued that Canadian universities may now be relying on contingent academics as extensively as their US counterparts. According to their research, the proportion of contract faculty in universities across the country range from 39 percent in British Columbia to 50 percent in Saskatchewan. However, these data are also compromised by unreliable information on part-timers because they rely on estimates from Statistics Canada’s part-time surveys (estimates that the authors acknowledge are unreliable). For example, Dobbie and Robinson reproduced Statistics Canada’s 1998 estimate of part-time faculty as their own for 2004. They justified this by pointing to (undocumented) “reports” by CUPE and the CAUT, which apparently

⁹⁷ It should be noted, however, that *chargés de cours* generally have better salaries and benefits than contract faculty in other provinces (MacDonald 2013).

indicated that the number of part-time faculty in Canadian universities remained relatively stable during the first half of the 2000s.

This snapshot of efforts to collect data on contract faculty in Canada makes clear that reliable data remain elusive. Again, this problem is largely attributable to universities, which have been either unwilling or unable to supply this information for decades. But which is it? Researchers at the Educational Policy Institute claim it is the latter and insist there is no “sinister motive” behind the lack of transparency (Junor, Kramer and Usher 2006: 8). Yet, even if the motives are not “sinister,” the idea that universities are unable to assemble hiring data on their contract employees seems implausible. A more likely explanation is that these institutions have no particular interest in compiling or releasing the information. Indeed, an accurate measure of the extent to which Canadian universities are substituting contract staff for tenured faculty could be a political liability for administrators. As part of my data gathering efforts, I also tried to address the question of whether administrators are unwilling or unable to provide information on contract faculty in their institutions. Prior to providing my results, I will first briefly review a previous attempt to collect this information on Ontario universities.

Access to Information in Ontario Universities: The OCUFA Test

In the 1990s, universities in Ontario established a series of voluntary guidelines to regulate their responses to access to information (ATI) requests as recommended by the Council of Ontario Universities. In 2004, the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations (OCUFA) decided to formally test the efficacy of these policies by submitting information requests on faculty hiring to 20 Ontario universities asking for the

number of (i) full-time tenure stream faculty, (ii) full-time sessional or contractually limited appointments, and (iii) part-time sessional or contractually limited appointments hired each year from 1999 to 2004. They also requested information on university hiring plans. The results of this “test” are revealing. Over a three-month period, four universities ignored the request entirely while nine acknowledged receipt of the request but did not provide any data. In fact, only seven institutions made an effort to provide the information and within this group, four supplied data that did not conform to the request or was of partial/limited use. Universities used various rationales to explain their lack of compliance. The University of Toronto and Queen’s University, for example, referred OCUFA researchers to flawed and outdated figures from Statistics Canada (according to the Toronto representative, this information was already in the public domain and therefore the university was under no further obligation). The University of Ottawa administration used a different tactic, and pointed to an exemption in its policy framework that allowed it to refuse access on the basis that the information was “expected to prejudice the economic or financial interests or the competitive position” of the university of Ottawa (OCUFA 2004: 6).⁹⁸ Thus, by any reasonable measure of public transparency or accountability, Ontario universities failed the test, which led the OCUFA to conclude that the voluntary guidelines covering ATIs were inadequate and that universities should be brought under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA).

⁹⁸ According to the OCUFA (2004: 5), “despite the stated willingness” of universities to be open and accountable about their practices, “there are many exemptions in the university access to information policies which are so broad as to make it possible for universities to habitually deny even nonsensitive access requests ... Perhaps the most troubling exemption is that which allows universities to refuse to share information which relates to ‘economic and other interests.’”

Just two years later, Ontario did expand its freedom of information laws to include public universities, which meant that these institutions were now included under the FIPPA legislation. Believing they were “already sensitive and accountable” to ATI requests, most universities were relatively untroubled by this development (Neufeldt 2009: 2). For example, the FIPPA officer at the University of Toronto stated that the new rules simply formalized the accountability procedures already in place. The reaction of other institutions suggested a similar “business as usual” attitude. Despite these claims, however, the inclusion of universities under the FIPPA has had important implications for researchers. First and foremost, the new requirements have the potential to increase information transparency on the part of universities, including information on contract faculty, which is especially important given the recent trend toward administrative secrecy under corporatization. Second, testing the impact of the FIPPA on universities provides a way to assess the legitimacy of past information claims; that is, by analyzing responses to similar ATIs before and after the new rules came into effect, researchers may finally be able to answer the question of whether universities have been “unwilling or unable” to provide data on contract faculty.

Collecting Contract Faculty Data under FIPPA

To address a gap in the higher education literature in Canada and test the boundaries of the FIPPA legislation, I sent ATI requests to 18 universities in Ontario in 2010. Similar to the OCUFA research, I requested longitudinal data on the number of (i) full-time tenured or tenure track faculty, (ii) full-time contract faculty, and (iii) part-time contract faculty hired each year from 2000 to 2010. I also requested information on university hiring

plans in 11 of my ATIs.⁹⁹ The key difference between the two sets of ATIs was that I requested data for select faculties/departments, while the OCUFA requested data for all university faculties.

Data Selection: Social Sciences and Humanities

My ATI requests primarily focused on faculties and departments within the social sciences and humanities. I primarily chose these disciplines on the basis of previous research, which has shown that contract faculty (and especially part-time faculty) are over-represented in these fields.¹⁰⁰ Further, it is important to recall the distinction between “classic” and “contemporary” contract workers. While classics typically have full-time careers outside of academia in professional fields such as law, business and medicine, contemporaries tend to teach basic core courses rather than narrow specialties and they comprise a higher share of scholars who desire a full-time academic career. Departments in the humanities and social sciences rely disproportionately on contemporaries, which is another reason I selected these disciplines. This selection strategy was also chosen to delimit the scope of my research and allow for a more feasible and cost-effective research design.

Collecting data from the social sciences and humanities involved one faculty at some universities and multiple faculties at others (see Appendix B for a complete listing of the faculties included in my ATI requests). There were also special cases, as follows:

⁹⁹ My partial “replication” of the OCUFA study was not planned in advance. That is, I did not encounter this research until after I sent out my first set of ATI requests. Coincidentally, we had requested similar data. In order to correspond more closely with the OCUFA’s requests, I added a fourth item on university hiring to my final 11 ATIs.

¹⁰⁰ Rajagopal (2002), for instance, found that two thirds of part-time faculty were employed in arts-related disciplines. The limitations of its data notwithstanding, Statistics Canada’s surveys also support this conclusion (e.g., Omiecinski 2003) as does US research (e.g., Cox 2000). For more recent information on contract faculty in sociology and anthropology specifically, see Muzzin (2008).

(i) at the University of Ontario Institute of Technology (UOIT), I requested and received data from all university faculties; (ii) at Trent, the unusual organization of academic units led me to request information from individual departments;¹⁰¹ (iii) at Toronto and Nipissing, arts departments are grouped with science departments in the “Faculty of Arts and Science,” so the data I requested (and obtained) from these universities included a broader range of disciplines; (iv) at Queen’s and Brock, I had to narrow down the list of departments within each faculty for reasons of cost;¹⁰² and (v) in a few instances (e.g., Carleton and Wilfrid Laurier), access coordinators were able to provide me with additional data from departments that fell outside the scope of my requests.

Data Collection

Throughout the data collection process, I worked closely with professional administrators from university information and privacy offices whose institutional affiliation was some variation of “Information and Privacy Coordinator” (hereafter referred to as access or information coordinator).¹⁰³ In some cases, I collaborated on a more informal basis with administrators who had no official connection to the ATI process, as well current and former university faculty, union representatives and even one university president. My working relationship with this diverse group of individuals (especially access

¹⁰¹ These departments included Women’s Studies, Sociology, Anthropology, Politics, Philosophy, Indigenous Studies, Modern Languages and Literatures, History, English Literature, School of Education, Economics, Cultural Studies, International Development Studies, Canadian Studies, Ancient History and Classics, and Business Administration.

¹⁰² Like Toronto and Nipissing, Queen’s merges arts and science departments within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. However, I did not receive any data from science departments at Queen’s because I eliminated these departments when I narrowed the list. The final list of departments at Queen’s included Geography, Economics, Political Studies, Psychology, Gender Studies, Sociology, History and Philosophy. At Brock, it included Canadian Studies, English Language and Literature, History, Philosophy, Economics, Geography, Labour Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology and Women’s Studies.

¹⁰³ Some of these job titles included FIPPA Coordinator; FOIP Coordinator; FIPPA Officer; Access and Privacy Assistant; Access and Privacy Officer; Access and Privacy Coordinator; and Chief Information Officer.

coordinators) included extensive email and telephone correspondence. Detailed field notes were prepared on the basis of this correspondence. In most cases, protracted rounds of discussion and negotiation were required to broker access, clarify data issues, correct mistakes, and, in some instances, work out a payment schedule. For the costs associated with each ATI request, see Appendix C. As I discuss throughout the next section, the data collection process yielded many important insights about the impact of the FIPPA on universities, the legitimacy of past information claims and the relationship between contingent academics and their employers.

Assessing the Impact of the FIPPA and Past Information Claims

In contrast to the OCUFA research, all 18 universities responded to my information requests within one month as required under the FIPPA. This fact alone suggests that the new laws have been important in compelling universities to be more responsive to ATIs. As well, most access coordinators were attentive to their obligations and made a concerted effort to conform to the legislation. In fact, one coordinator was so mindful of the FIPPA requirements that she asked me to submit a second formal request to help cover the fact that the university violated a time deadline. A more important difference between the OCUFA study and my research, however, was the provision of data. While 13 institutions provided no data whatsoever to the OCUFA (and four supplied data that was irrelevant or semi-useful), I received data from all 18 institutions.¹⁰⁴ In only two cases – Lakehead and McMaster – were complete sets of data for all types of faculty

¹⁰⁴ Universities varied considerably in the time they took to produce the information. For a complete listing of each university's information timeline, see Appendix D.

never produced (both omitted data on part-timers).¹⁰⁵ Needless to say, the differential response of universities to the two sets of ATIs is striking (for a summary, see Table 5.1). These differences suggest that universities are not now, nor have they likely ever been, unable to provide data on contract faculty, and that the problems encountered by past researchers resided in political self-interest and “unwilling” administrators.

This conclusion about the reluctance to release this kind of information was also supported by some of my own experiences during the data collection process. Research on ATI process in Canada has shown that access coordinators occupy a role somewhere between “neutral mediator,” or an honest broker between two parties, and “information gatekeeper,” where a coordinator seeks to preserve informational secrecy on the part of an agency, organization or institution (Larsen and Walby 2012). Some common gatekeeper strategies include the use of broad exemption clauses in ATI laws, lengthy extensions/delays and prohibitive fee estimates. In my judgement, *most* of the information coordinators I worked with assumed the role of mediator. For instance, while it was my perception that a few coordinators used time extensions in a disingenuous manner to thwart my requests, these delays more often resulted from mundane problems of data collection. And although large fee estimates had the potential to obstruct access – which I believe was sometimes the intent – fee waivers or reductions were usually granted. The same cannot be said, however, about many of the administrators I worked

¹⁰⁵ I use the term “complete” loosely. Within these datasets there were sometimes missing years (e.g., Guelph did not supply data on full-time contract faculty for 2000-01 or 2001-02) and other variations/omissions. For example, in the cases of Wilfrid Laurier, data was provided for all three groups of faculty but in a format for part-timers that was limited for comparison purposes. In the case of Toronto, no information was available on the number of graduate students who taught on a contract basis prior to 2006.

**Table 5.1
University Responses to ATI Requests**

University	<u>OCUFA Study (2004)</u>				<u>My Study (2010)</u>			
	Provided Data		Data Relevant / Useful		Provided Data		Data Relevant / Useful	
	Yes	No	Yes	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Partial
York	√			√	√		√	
Toronto		√			√		√	
Carleton		√			√		√	
Ottawa		√			√		√	
Guelph	√			√	√		√	
Brock	√		√		√		√	
Queen's		√			√		√	
Waterloo		√			√		√	
Ryerson		√			√		√	
Western	√			√	√		√	
Windsor		√			√		√	
McMaster		√			√			√
Lakehead		√			√			√
Laurentian		√			√		√	
Nipissing		√			√		√	
Wilfrid Laurier	√			√	√		√	
Trent	√		√		√		√	
UOIT	√		√		√		√	
Ottawa		√			√		√	

Note: The OCUFA also sent information requests to Algoma University and OCAD University, neither of which provided any data

with on a more informal basis. These managers tended to assume a gatekeeper role and a guarded stance toward the release of the information. At one institution, for example, I was informed by the access coordinator that no decision had been made about releasing the data, even though a fee estimate had been produced and data collection was nearly complete. After an additional two month delay, the coordinator conceded that certain “interested parties” within the administration wanted to see what the data showed before making it public, and one of them requested to speak with me directly to inquire about how the information would be used. At another institution that relies heavily on contract faculty, a high level administrator provided me with a number of justifications (without evidence) as to why so many contract faculty were employed at the institution. For these reasons, he said, the information I was requesting could be misleading and “contentious,” and that I should forgo my search for headcount data in favour of the full-time equivalency data already in the public domain.¹⁰⁶ When I eventually received the “contentious” headcount data, this same administrator warned me on several occasions to interpret the figures with “caution” and “care,” and to not portray the data in a misleading way. Another case of note (among many) involved a university president intervening to delay my request under section 27 (1) of the FIPPA, which states that an institution head is permitted to extend the time limit (for a “reasonable” period) in those circumstances where processing the request would “unreasonably interfere with the operations of the institution.” Critics have noted that this kind of broad language can be interpreted in such a way as to delay most information requests indefinitely. Although I did receive the data

¹⁰⁶ With respect to workload, full-time equivalency is measured by dividing the total number of hours that part-timers teach by the number of hours in a full-time faculty member’s average workload. It is also sometimes used as a proxy measure of how many full-time appointments would be needed to replace the total teaching hours of part-timers.

after a long interruption and much persistence, the intervention was concerning given this administration's ongoing reputation for assuming a gatekeeper role in other ATI requests. In sum, the issue of contract hiring has clear political overtones and I experienced this firsthand in my encounters with multiple institutions. Again, the differential response of universities to the two sets of ATIs and my own experiences working with university administrators supports the argument that the previous lack of transparency was political in nature. I would emphasize that this kind of political sensitivity to "contentious" issues like the casualization of academic labour has increased under corporatization, where concerns about market reputation and the university's "brand name" have led to greater administrative secrecy and intolerance of institutional criticism.

I should also note, however, that an explanation that reduces the problem to "unwilling" administrators is too simplistic. More specifically, based on what I observed, I would contend that the longstanding inability of researchers to gain access to these data also resides in the nature of university data management, which has been made more problematic by the precarious relationship between universities and their contract employees. For example, part of the difficulty in generating statistics on contract faculty has to do with the way they are defined, categorized and prioritized within the academy. Some universities do not differentiate between full-time and part-time contract staff. Others maintain records of full-time faculty but not part-time faculty. Further complicating matters is that part-time faculty are variously defined by a number of factors, including the number of courses they teach, the length of their contract, how they

are appointed and by reference to a union bargaining unit.¹⁰⁷ These categorical ambiguities also extend to the tenuous hold these workers have over their status as faculty. In fact, many administrators I spoke with literally did not understand what I meant by contract faculty, especially part-time contract faculty. This confusion was because their definition of “faculty” was restricted to tenure stream professors.¹⁰⁸ The tenuous employment status of sessionals – in that they are not defined as “real” faculty in the institutional hierarchy – generally means that less care is taken in institutional record keeping and information management, which has a range of implications for data collection. In contrast, not one university had *any* problem gathering or providing statistics on tenure stream faculty.

Poor data management also gave rise to technical problems and difficulties in extracting the data. At one university, for example, I was informed by an exasperated access coordinator that “manual searching and inspection of email and electronic documents” was required to locate and identify contract employees. Following this, “multiple queries and cross-referencing on different databases” was needed to account for the ways that job codes, types and categories changed over time. Then “filters” had to be applied to “start and end dates to determine if the courses were cancelled or voided.” This was not a unique situation; in fact, many coordinators had to take a determined and creative approach to fulfill my requests. A related problem for coordinators was that the

¹⁰⁷ At Ryerson, for instance, part-time faculty are grouped into two categories: “Limited Term” and “Reduced and Part-Time Sessionals.” At Lakehead, there is a three-tiered system of sessionals and not all of these tiers are part of a bargaining unit or represented under the collective agreement. At the University of Toronto, part-time instructors are differentially categorized according to the length of their contract, their method of appointment and their bargaining unit. The formation of a new collective bargaining unit in 2003 (representing teaching staff with appointments of less than 12 months) further increased this complexity.

¹⁰⁸ In one of these cases, I raised questions about the appropriate definition of “faculty” and received a lecture from human resources personnel about how universities work and the importance of accurate terminology in social science research.

data was often “hidden” or not accessible at first glance. In one case, I was informed that a records search for part-time faculty had been conducted in four university departments/offices: 1) Academic Staff Relations; 2) Financial Services; 3) Institutional Planning, and 4) Office of the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. This search turned up nothing. Five months and several deadline extensions later, I was informed that responsive records on part-timers *did* exist after all, and that they had been found in four different university departments/offices: 1) Academic Staff Relations; 2) Financial Services; 3) Institutional Planning, and 4) Office of the Dean, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Clearly, the data was there all along but in such a way that a cursory search revealed nothing.

It is also interesting to note that some access coordinators were confused as to why their institutions did not keep adequate records of contract faculty. I believe this is one reason why several of them undertook a personal crusade to find the information (or, at the very least, find out why it was not available). For instance, at one institution a coordinator conducted an extensive preliminary search of institutional records and data archives, at the end of which she remarked that “I just can’t believe we don’t keep track of contract faculty in any meaningful way.” Undeterred, she renewed her search for several months, even reaching out to Statistics Canada for assistance. With all leads virtually exhausted, the coordinator stated that “as hard as this may be to believe, the university simply has no reliable records of its contract employees.” This sense of disbelief was by no means unique to this administrator. Another coordinator I worked with called the lack of record keeping “mind-boggling;” a third speculated that such shoddy data management must be somehow deliberate on the part of the university.

To conclude, my success in obtaining complete datasets from the vast majority of institutions I contacted suggests that Ontario universities are, for the most part, able to collect and disseminate data on contract faculty, and that the legal requirements of the FIPPA have been crucial in compelling them to do so. That being said, the previous lack of information transparency requires a more nuanced explanation. Poor data management and data extraction difficulties, which are at least partly connected to the tenuous employment status of contract academics in general, suggest that some administrators may have sincerely believed that they were “unable” to supply this information to researchers.

Results and Analysis

A Note on Headcount and Intensity Data

As a result of my information requests, I obtained headcount data from all 18 universities. Strictly speaking, headcount data reflects the number of positions or appointments in each academic unit, not the number of individuals.¹⁰⁹ In the case of tenured/tenure track faculty and full-time contract faculty, the number of positions are virtually identical to the number of individuals because these faculty rarely work in multiple departments (in cases where individuals were cross-appointed, care was taken to count them within their home department only). The difference between the number of positions and the number of individuals only becomes an issue with part-time faculty because a small but significant

¹⁰⁹ My headcount data is limited by the fact that I was unable to obtain gender breakdowns. As noted in the last chapter, previous research has shown that women are over-represented among university contract faculty, especially in relation to the proportion of women in higher academic ranks. Early in the research process, I inquired about gender breakdowns at several institutions. I was informed either that it would not be possible, or that it would add many hours of work to my request and result in major fee increases.

proportion of these individuals teach in multiple departments within and across universities. Therefore, there is a potential to “double count” these individuals and inflate the numbers. Generally speaking, however, the difference between the number of appointments and the number of individuals is relatively small. This can be illustrated, for example, by looking at data I received from the University of Western Ontario – an institution that relies heavily on part-time faculty – where the access coordinator was able to control for individuals working in multiple departments. The data shows that in the Faculty of Social Science, there were 182 part-time appointments in 2009-10. When individuals working in multiple departments were accounted for, this number fell only slightly to 176. For the entire decade, the percentage increase in the number of part-time appointments in the faculty was nearly identical to the increase in the number of part-time employees (and these differences were only slightly more pronounced in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities). So, while the number of appointments is not a perfect proxy for the number of individuals, the two measures can be generalized without resulting in any major distortions. For the sake of accuracy, however, I generally refer to “positions” or “appointments” (rather than individuals) when referring to changes in the number of part-time faculty over time. In addition to headcount data, I also accounted for the “intensity” of contract faculty use. This distinction is important because changes in the number or percentage of contract appointments can be misleading if examined in isolation. The intensity of contract faculty use is defined here as the ratio of tenured/tenure track appointments to contract appointments (part-time or full-time). Simply put, the lower the

ratio, the greater the intensity.¹¹⁰

The Growth in Part-Time Sessional Appointments

As noted above, with the exception of Lakehead and McMaster, I received longitudinal data on part-time contract faculty for all of the universities in my study. I have organized these data into three intensity groups: those that I categorized as having a “high” average intensity of part-time faculty use during the 2000s; those with a “moderate” intensity; and those with a “low” intensity use of part-time faculty use over this time period. Each of these groupings – along with specific details about the individual universities within them – will be reviewed in turn.

Included in the first or high intensity group of institutions are York, Carleton, Western, Nipissing and Ottawa. To start, of all the universities in my sample, York’s reliance on part-time faculty was the most extreme. Its intensity ratio – or ratio of tenured/tenure track faculty to part-time appointments – was just 0.66 in the Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LAPS).¹¹¹ Moreover, this ratio fell sharply over the decade, from 0.93 in 2000-01 to 0.47 in 2009-10. Looking at the headcount data, the number of part-time positions increased from 531 to 1253 (136 percent) over this period, while the number of tenure stream faculty grew from 493 to 593 (18.3 percent). The growth in part-time positions was especially prominent in certain departments, such as

¹¹⁰ Another intensity measure that is sometimes used by researchers is the proportion of courses taught by contract faculty, or their institutional teaching load, at any given institution. Some research has shown that the number of contract appointments does provide a reasonable estimate of overall teaching load (e.g., Dobbie and Robinson 2008), but using headcount data as a proxy for this measure can be problematic. Moreover, with the exception of Carleton and Wilfrid Laurier, I was not provided with this kind of data. For these reasons, I generally limit my discussion of contract faculty teaching loads to information acquired from secondary sources.

¹¹¹ The Faculty of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies (LAPS) was created through a merger of the Faculty of Arts and Atkinson College in 2009-10. During the 2000s, some departments moved to other faculties on campus. The time series data supplied by the York administration mapped the changes in those departments that remain in the LAPS.

English (563.6 percent); Languages, Literatures and Linguistics (179.5 percent); Administrative Studies (174.1 percent); and Philosophy (168.8 percent). These data are summarized in Table 5.2. There are a few other points to mention with respect to part-time hiring at York. First, it has been reported that part-time faculty are responsible for between 50 and 60 percent of all teaching at the university (e.g., CUPE 2010a; Ghabrial 2009; Lafrance 2010). Second, the data I received from the administration differs significantly from the data found in the York University Factbook. Most notably, my data indicates that there were far more part-time sessionals hired during the 2000s than the “official” Factbook figures suggest.¹¹² Third, it is instructive to contrast my data with relevant remarks within the university’s public statements. For instance, the administration claims that (i) York has made a definitive commitment to the growth and renewal of its full-time faculty complement, and (ii) it is “axiomatic” that university teachers are also active researchers (i.e., teaching and research are “inseparable”) (e.g., York University 2005, 2010). However, not only are part-timers being hired at a *much* greater rate than full-time faculty at York (at least in the LAPS), but limited-term contracts do not generally recognize the research and service components of academic work or provide these faculty with appropriate resources and protections to engage in a full academic career.¹¹³

¹¹² For example, my data show that the total number of part-time positions in the LAPS was over 1,000 each year between 2007-08 and 2009-10. Yet, the 2011-12 edition of the Factbook (the only year for which headcount data was provided by faculty) claims that the total number of contract faculty (headcount by contract) in the LAPS was just 773. I contacted the administration on more than one occasion about this discrepancy but did not receive a satisfactory explanation.

¹¹³ It should be noted that York has made some effort to “regularize” the positions of long serving sessionals. For example, instructors with 10 years of teaching experience can apply for a “Long Service Teaching Appointment,” which guarantees them three full courses in each of the next three years as well as additional pay.

Table 5.2
York Part-Time Contract Faculty (LAPS)

Department	00/ 01	01/ 02	02/ 03	03/ 04	04/ 05	05/ 06	06 /07	07/ 08	08/ 09	09/ 10
Administrative Studies	81	124	146	164	164	178	203	247	210	222
Anthropology	22	13	16	13	13	8	14	17	21	21
Communication Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Economics	49	41	38	43	33	25	33	60	49	60
English	11	22	7	18	25	26	57	38	48	73
Equity Studies	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
French Studies	20	10	13	13	19	21	19	26	25	22
Human Resource Mgmt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
History	13	14	10	7	23	19	13	18	22	27
Humanities	36	39	32	37	44	43	36	46	34	112
Information Technology	58	87	107	18	148	0	13	20	20	20
Languages, Literatures & Linguistics	44	51	61	79	79	80	79	91	94	123
Philosophy	16	16	8	13	24	22	19	23	29	43
Political Science	35	56	34	40	49	49	47	29	43	58
Public Policy & Admin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	20	25
School of Arts & Letters	0	37	42	38	49	37	88	115	123	52
Social Science	50	71	157	80	86	93	98	119	110	97
Social Work	27	32	29	30	39	43	53	59	50	47
Sociology	29	31	23	39	39	47	55	68	63	41
Women's Studies	11	11	11	11	14	14	10	10	6	12

Department	00/ 01	01/ 02	02/ 03	03/ 04	04/ 05	05/ 06	06 /07	07/ 08	08/ 09	09/ 10
Writing Department	16	16	15	19	18	21	20	20	17	12
Total – Part-Time	531	681	758	675	882	746	883	1047	1027	1253
Total – Prob/Tenure	493	496	483	497	537	518	551	608	610	583

For Carleton, I was able to obtain data on part-time sessionals for *all* university faculties as well as the number and proportion of courses taught by contract faculty over time (see Table 5.3). Like York, at Carleton there has been a high intensity of part-time use, with the number of part-time positions increasing sharply over the 2000s. In the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the average ratio of tenure stream to part-time appointments was 1.10. Somewhat surprisingly, an identical ratio was found for the university as a whole. In terms of headcount data, the number of part-time positions in the Arts and Social Sciences increased from 166 to 321 (93.4 percent) between 2001-02 and 2011-12. In contrast, the number of tenure stream positions increased from 211 to 248 (17.5 percent) between 2001 and 2011.¹¹⁴ Looking at other university faculties, the number of part-time appointments increased from 150 to 237 (58 percent) in Public Affairs; 46 to 65 (41.3 percent) in Business; 57 to 81 (42.1 percent) in Science; and 56 to 117 (108.9 percent) in Engineering.¹¹⁵ Overall, the number of part-time appointments in the university increased from 475 to 821 (72.8 percent) between 2001-02 and 2011-12,

¹¹⁴ The data for tenure/tenure track faculty – largely drawn from the Carleton Factbook – was provided by calendar year, while the data for part-time faculty was provided by academic year.

¹¹⁵ Some of the largest increases in part-time appointments were found in English, History, Psychology, Law, Political Science and Social Work (all of which are located within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Faculty of Public Affairs).

while those in the tenure stream rose from 608 to 745 (22.5 percent) over roughly the same period. As a result, Carleton's part-time intensity ratio fell from 1.32 in 2001-02 to 0.91 in 2010-11 (this ratio in the Arts and Social Sciences fell somewhat more steeply, from 1.34 to 0.83).¹¹⁶ Also of note is that sessional hiring at Carleton appears to be accelerating. That is, most of the divergence between part-time and tenure track hiring occurred between 2004-05 and 2011-12. For example, part-time positions in the Arts and Social Sciences rose 87.7 percent during this period and 58.2 percent across the university as a whole. By comparison, the number of tenure stream professors rose by just 5.5 and 12.7 percent. Table 5.3 also shows that between 2003-04 and 2011-12, the number of undergraduate courses taught by part-time sessionals increased from 705 to 1327. This represented an increase of 88.2 percent (or 122.8 percent in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences).¹¹⁷ Over the same period, the total number of undergraduate courses offered in the university grew by just 15.9 percent (from 3444 to 3993). So, not only are part-timers being hired in greater numbers, they are performing a larger and larger share of university teaching. In 2003-04, part-timers were responsible for teaching one out of every five undergraduate courses; eight years later, they were teaching one in three.

Western, Nipissing and Ottawa also showed a high intensity of part time faculty use. The key difference was that at each of these institutions, part-time relative to tenure stream hiring was more variable over the decade. Beginning at Western, the part-time

¹¹⁶ Yearly ratios are not precise as they reflect a combination of calendar and academic years.

¹¹⁷ The totals for part-time faculty do not include courses taught on a contract basis by retired faculty. Cross-listed courses are assigned to the faculty/department listed as offering the course.

**Table 5.3
Carleton University**

Part-Time Faculty Headcount	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
Arts & Social Sciences	166	188	187	171	222	214	243	264	284	300	321
Public Affairs	150*	158*	160	167	196	236	235	255	261	245	237
Business	46*	61*	56	42	49	65	54	63	68	80	65
Science	57	53	59	60	71	68	77	78	79	77	81
Engineering	56	60	59	79	90	88	91	101	102	112	117
University Total	475	520	521	519	628	671	700	761	794	815	821
Tenure/ Tenure Track Faculty Headcount	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10	11
Arts & Social Sciences	211	222	234	235	225	228	249	244	252	254	248
University Total	608	625	658	661	658	664	695	705	729	734	745
Course Load	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
Total Number of Undergrad Courses	n/a	n/a	3444	3558	3710	3955	3914	3925	3850	3986	3993
Courses Taught by Part-Timers: Arts & Social Sciences	234	263	267	262	323	324	357	417	502	515	595

Course Load	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12
Courses Taught by Part-Timers: University	656	707	705	744	903	1018	1046	1135	1227	1260	1327
Percentage of Undergrad Courses Taught by Part-Timers	n/a	n/a	20%	21%	24%	25%	27%	29%	32%	32%	33%

** The Faculty of Public Affairs and Management became the Faculty of Public Affairs in 2003-04. At this time, "Business" (previously located within the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management) became its own faculty. Faculty members in the department of Business prior to 2003-04 were separated out in these data.*

intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and the Faculty of Social Science was 0.95. Between 2001-02 and 2007-08, the number of part-time appointments increased from 263 to 363 (38 percent) while the number of tenured stream faculty rose from 286 to 338 (18.2 percent). From 2007-08 to 2009-10, however, there was a moderate decline in part-time positions while the number of tenure stream faculty remained constant. These variations mean that Western's intensity ratio fluctuated from 1.09 in 2000-01, to 0.93 in 2007-08, to 1.07 in 2009-10. According to Alison Hearn (2010), over 50 percent of undergraduate teaching at Western is performed by contract faculty. A similar pattern was evident at Nipissing, which had an average intensity ratio of 1.03. Between 2001-02 and 2006-07, the number of part-time positions in the Faculty of Arts and Science¹¹⁸ increased from 37 to 88 and its intensity ratio fell from 1.24 to 0.80. In contrast, from 2006-07 to 2009-10 the number of part-time appointments held

¹¹⁸ In 2008, the Faculty of Arts and Science divided into the Faculty of Arts and Science and the Faculty of Applied and Professional Studies. For the sake of accuracy, all data after 2008 include both faculties.

relatively stable while tenure stream hiring increased, and Nipissing's ratio rose to 1.08.¹¹⁹

For the last of the first grouping of universities, my research found that Ottawa's part-time intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Social Sciences was 1.04. Again, however, there were significant fluctuations over the decade as Ottawa's ratio oscillated from 1.04 in 2000, to 0.95 in 2005, to 1.16 in 2010. While part-time hiring did not decline in absolute terms, as it did at Western, there was a significant reduction in these hires relative to the tenure stream after 2005. Over the decade, my data indicate that the number of part-time appointments in the two faculties increased by 39.8 percent (304 to 425) and, somewhat surprisingly, the number of tenured/tenure track positions rose by 56.8 percent (315 to 494). Of course, Ottawa continues to rely heavily on part-time teaching. The Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa (2011) reports that its members are responsible for teaching nearly 60 percent of all courses. Nevertheless, unlike most other schools the university has continued to invest strongly in tenure stream positions, at least in the faculties under review. The numbers within departments varied considerably. In English, Political Studies and Psychology, for example, the number of part-time appointments rose by 117.7 percent, whereas tenure stream appointments rose by just 23.3 percent.

The second group of universities I will review are those with intermediate part-time intensity ratios: Windsor (1.28), Trent (1.29), UOIT (1.33), Waterloo (1.35) and

¹¹⁹ It should also be noted that the actual number of part-time teaching appointments at Nipissing is somewhat higher than these data suggest because a limited number of part-time instructors are grouped within the Contract Academic Staff Bargaining Unit (CASBU). The CASBU union includes some part-time instructors teaching single courses, full-time instructors, "service course" instructors (courses that do not count toward a major), seminar leaders and lab instructors. For logistical reasons, instructors within this union could not be separated from the other employees and, therefore, are not included in my analysis. However, these omissions were not large enough to compromise the overall integrity of the data.

Guelph (1.52). Within this group, Trent stands out in terms of its growing dependence on part-time appointments. Although the university's average intensity ratio was not as high as the five universities classified in the first group, its reliance on part-time faculty has risen dramatically over the decade (see Table 5.4). In the 16 departments under review, the number of part-time positions increased from 66 to 200 (203 percent). At the same time, the number of tenured/tenure track positions increased from 138 to 156 (13 percent). As a result, Trent's intensity ratio declined from 2.09 in 2000 to 0.78 in 2010. This positioned Trent second only to York in terms of its reliance of part-time faculty at the end of the decade. Turning to Windsor, the part-time intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences fell slowly but steadily over the decade, from 1.41 in 2000 to 1.20 in 2010. Put another way, the number of tenure stream positions at Windsor increased by 15.7 percent, while the number of part-time positions rose by 35.6 percent. Windsor's School of Music experienced the greatest change to its faculty complement. In 2001, the School had seven tenure stream faculty and 24 part-time appointments; by 2010, these numbers were six and 39 respectively. Like Carleton, at UOIT I was able to obtain data for all university faculties. From 2003 (the year it first accepted students) to 2010, the university's ratio of tenure stream to part-time appointments fell from 1.74 to 1.05. However, this seemingly large increase in part-time hiring needs to be qualified by the fact that from 2003 to 2009, UOIT actually hired more tenure stream faculty than part-time faculty. Interestingly, this trend changed between 2009 and 2010, when the number of part-time positions jumped from 117 to 153 and only seven tenure stream

faculty were added.¹²⁰

Guelph's part-time intensity ratio in the College of Arts and College of Social and Applied Human Sciences also fell significantly over the 2000s, from 1.63 in 2000-01 to 1.17 in 2009-10. This decline was solely a result of increased sessional hiring in the College of Social and Applied Human Sciences, where the number of part-time positions increased from 29 to 117, or by a remarkable 303.5 percent. At the same time, tenure stream positions increased from 91 to 114 (25.3 percent). Lastly, Waterloo's intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts fell from 1.47 in 2001 to 1.30 in 2010. Looking at the headcount data, the number of tenure/tenure track faculty increased from 195 to 236 (21 percent) while the number of part-time positions rose from 133 to 181 (36.1 percent). Like UOIT, however, much of the increase in part-time hiring came very late in the decade at Waterloo. Between 2009 and 2010, part-time appointments grew from 152 to 181, while those in the tenure stream declined. Certain departments within the Faculty of Arts were much more likely to rely on contract faculty; for example, in Economics, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology, the number of part-time appointments rose by 84 percent, while those in the tenure stream increased by just 19 percent.

The third group of universities in my study are those with the highest ratios of tenure stream faculty to part-time appointments, or the lowest intensity of part-time faculty use. These include Queen's (2.04), Brock (2.17), Laurentian (2.19), Ryerson (2.40) and Toronto (3.78). In the case of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (select

¹²⁰ In 2010, there were more tenure stream positions than part-time positions in five of seven university faculties (Business and Information Technology; Energy Systems and Nuclear Science; Engineering and Applied Science; Science; and Social Science and Humanities). In the other two faculties, the number of part-time positions considerably outnumbered those in the tenure stream. These included Education (with 14 tenure stream versus 33 part-time positions) and Health Sciences (with 20 tenure stream and 34 part-time positions).

Table 5.4
Trent – Part Time Sessional Appointments

Department	Year										
	00	01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	10
Women's Studies	5	2	7	8	7	6	3	3	7	8	8
Sociology	5	12	10	8	8	7	5	7	10	13	13
Anthropology	3	2	6	2	2	1	12	2	11	8	7
Politics	2	0	4	11	10	12	6	8	5	7	13
Philosophy	3	2	4	8	5	4	5	8	14	11	15
Indigenous Studies	8	5	8	8	9	5	13	8	6	4	6
Modern Languages & Literatures	4	5	8	5	5	7	8	6	19	17	14
History	4	11	12	8	10	13	10	9	16	15	17
English Literature	8	10	10	15	18	8	16	5	14	13	8
School of Education	-	-	-	21	33	58	62	61	52	46	37
Economics	4	3	5	6	5	5	4	3	5	5	9
Cultural Studies	5	5	7	9	9	15	13	13	15	11	11
International Development Studies	3	2	3	3	4	10	5	5	8	8	6
Canadian Studies	1	2	4	3	6	7	7	5	2	4	8
Ancient History & Classics	2	0	2	3	1	5	7	3	3	2	9
Business Administration	9	8	4	5	9	7	7	7	10	17	19
Totals (Part-Time)	66	69	94	123	141	170	183	153	197	189	200
Totals (Tenure Stream)	138	141	146	167	186	182	181	186	173	167	156

departments) at Queen's, two distinct hiring trends are evident. On the one hand, part-time appointments rose from 56 to 103 (83.9 percent) between 2000 and 2007 and the

intensity ratio fell from 2.61 to 1.50. Over this period, significant increases in part-time hiring were found in every department with the exception of Sociology. In contrast, the number of tenure stream positions remained relatively stable (6.2 percent increase). On the other hand, between 2007 and 2009, the number of part-time positions declined from 103 to 70, while the number of tenure stream positions held constant (accordingly, the intensity ratio grew from 1.50 to 2.23). This late drop in part-time hiring meant that the overall increase in part-time appointments was just 25 percent over the decade, whereas the rise in tenure stream faculty was 6.8 percent.

The hiring trends at Ryerson and Laurentian over this timeframe show a similar pattern to Queen's. The number of part-time positions in the Faculty of Arts at Ryerson increased by 102.6 percent between 2000 and 2008, with especially large increases in Philosophy and Politics & Public Administration. The number of tenured/tenure track faculty rose by 61.7 percent. Between 2008 and 2010, however, these appointments fell from 79 to 47 at the same time as the number of tenure stream faculty continued to rise. Similarly, Laurentian's intensity ratio in the Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities fell from 2.68 in 2000-01 to 1.55 in 2006-07. During this time, the number of tenure stream positions increased from 107 to 116, and the number of part-time appointments nearly doubled, from 40 to 75. Once again, however, part-time hiring relative to tenure stream hiring declined in subsequent years; by 2009-10 Laurentian's intensity ratio had increased to 1.96. Interestingly, variable hiring patterns were also evident at Brock but in the opposite direction. Looking at select departments in the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Social Sciences, part-time appointments in relation to tenure stream hiring declined between 2000 and 2004. From 2004 to 2009, however, the number of part-time

positions increased by 81.6 percent while tenure stream positions rose by just 8.5 percent.¹²¹

At Canada's largest university – the University of Toronto – I calculated a part-time intensity ratio of 3.78 in the Faculty of Arts and Science, which was the highest of any university in my sample. However, it must be noted that this ratio does *not* include graduate students who teach courses at the university (I could only secure data on student instructors from 2006 to 2010). Excluding this group of sessionals for the moment, Toronto's part-time intensity ratio fell dramatically between 2001-02 and 2007-08, from 7.82 to 2.49 (with a moderate rise thereafter). Looking at headcount data, the number of part-time appointments climbed from 85 to 285 during this period (a 235 percent increase), while the number of tenure stream faculty rose from 665 to 711, or by just 6.9 percent. Again, these data do not account for the large number of graduate students working as sessional instructors. In the latter half of the 2000s, there was an average of 169 teaching appointments held by graduate students in the Faculty of Arts and Science. This means that from 2005-06 to 2009-10, the average part-time intensity ratio was actually 1.65, not 2.70. It may, therefore, be more accurate to position Toronto as belonging to the intermediate category of universities.

The final university in my sample was Wilfrid Laurier. The data I received from Laurier was useful but limited for comparison purposes. The reason is that the coordinator was only able to track contract appointments on a per-course rather than per-instructor basis in the Faculty of Arts. According to the data, the number of *courses*

¹²¹ An especially large increase in part-time hiring occurred between 2004 and 2006. During this period, part-time positions increased from 21 to 61, with most of the growth concentrated in Political Science, Psychology and Sociology. Within these departments, part-time appointments rose from 14 to 48 while the number of tenure stream positions declined from 59 to 56.

taught by contract instructors in the Faculty of Arts increased from 222 in 2003-04 to 361 in 2008-09 (a 62.6 percent increase).¹²² In some departments, the growth in contract teaching was especially noteworthy. For example, the number of courses taught by part-time faculty in English and Film Studies, Global Studies, Languages and Literature, Political Science, Religion and Culture, and Communication Studies nearly doubled, from 111 to 208. Without data on the overall number of courses offered, it is difficult to make definitive conclusions about teaching loads; however, I do know that the number of tenure stream faculty rose modestly over this period – from 136 to 160 – suggesting that most new courses were taken up by contract hires.¹²³ These data also suggest that Laurier has a very high intensity of part-time use. For instance, even if every contract instructor taught an average of two courses per term (and the average number is likely much lower), Laurier's intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts would be 0.89 in 2008-09. At 1.5 courses per term, the ratio would be 0.66. Laurier's access coordinator was also able to provide me with an overall count of the number of contract faculty employed each term in the university over time. Between 2001-02 and 2009-10, the data shows that the number of contract instructors increased by an average of 5.1 percent each fall term (264 to 372); 4.8 percent each winter term (284 to 392); and 0.9 percent each summer term (113 to 121). Again, conclusions are difficult without comparable data on tenure stream hiring, but it is safe to assume that contact hires significantly exceeded tenure stream appointments during this period.

¹²² Fine Arts was eliminated from the analysis because no data was available for this department after 2006-07.

¹²³ It has also been reported that contract faculty teach approximately 45 percent of all courses at Laurier, yet they comprise only seven percent of the university's salary costs (Salatka 2013).

To conclude, my research data confirm that there is a growing reliance on part-time contract faculty in Ontario universities. Across all 15 institutions for which comparative headcount data were available, the number of part-time appointments increased by 68.5 percent between 2001-02 and 2009-10. Over the same period, the number of tenure stream positions increased by 30.4 percent.¹²⁴ Put another way, in 2001-02 tenure stream appointments outnumbered part-time appointments by 637 (3113 versus 2476); by 2009-10, there were fewer tenure stream appointments than part-time appointments (4060 versus 4173). It is worth noting that these disparities would likely be even larger if comparable figures for McMaster, Lakehead and Wilfrid Laurier were included (as supported by qualitative information gathered throughout the research process). For example, one instructor I spoke to at Lakehead indicated that there are hundreds of contract faculty working at the university, but the actual numbers have never been made public. Also, a retired Lakehead professor informed me that the university has a long history of being uncooperative in sharing information on its sessional employees. At McMaster, the number of part-time faculty also reportedly number in the hundreds. In consultation with a representative from CUPE 3906, I learned that there were 372 sessional faculty teaching 454 undergrad courses and 74 grad courses in the 2009-10 academic year. Moreover, these workers have traditionally been some of the most poorly compensated university teachers in Ontario (CUPE 2008b). The data I received from Wilfrid Laurier also demonstrate a heavy reliance on part-time faculty. In fact, according to Herbert Pimlott (2013), Laurier employs some of the largest numbers of part-time faculty in the country.

¹²⁴ Nine institutions provided data by calendar year while the other nine provided data by academic year. As a result, these are not precise percentage change figures.

It is also interesting to note that most of the growth in part-time hiring occurred between 2001-02 and 2007-08 (a 60.2 percent increase). From 2007-08 to 2009-10, part-time appointments increased by just 5.2 percent. And if York is excluded from the analysis (i.e., if part-time appointments at York remained constant), the number of part-time positions would have remained the same over this two-year period (decreasing by 2.6 percent between 2008-09 and 2009-10). Indeed, with a few notable exceptions, such as UOIT and Waterloo, part-time hiring at most universities declined late in the decade. More specifically, the number of part-time appointments dropped at eight of 15 universities between 2007-08 and 2009-10; and at 11 of 15 universities between 2008-09 and 2009-10. It is possible that some of this decline may be related to universities (re-)investing in tenure stream positions, or converting part-time workers to full-time sessionals. At Ryerson, for example, the decline in part-time sessionals after 2008 was accompanied by an increase in tenure stream hiring and a large growth in the number of full-time sessionals. According to one Ryerson administrator, these changes were likely a result of some part-timers being converted to full sessionals as additional courses for contract faculty became available. Generally speaking, however, this explanation is not supported by my data. For one, the number of full-time sessionals also declined late in the decade (as discussed below). Second, the lower rate of part-time hiring after 2007-08 was not matched by significant increases in tenure stream hiring. In fact, the number of tenure stream faculty at the 15 institutions increased by just three percent between 2007-08 and 2009-10, and by just one percent between 2008-09 and 2009-10. These data suggest, therefore, that the primary explanation for the decline in part-time appointments over this recent period lies elsewhere.

Based on my research and discussions with various university personnel throughout the process, I would contend that one of the key contributing factors was the global economic crisis that took place over this timeframe. Unlike the situation in the US, in Canada, the *financial* impact of the crisis on higher education was minimal (OCUFA 2010a).¹²⁵ That is not to say, however, that it did not have an impact. For Canadian universities, the impact was primarily political in nature. That is, many institutions used the crisis to justify a series of austerity measures, such as hiring freezes, course/program reductions, layoffs and service cuts. In fact, by early 2010, two thirds of Ontario universities had announced hiring freezes or slow-downs (OCUFA 2010b). In turn, these measures contributed to declining employment opportunities for part-time faculty late in the decade. In 2009, for example, McMaster announced across-the-board layoffs, program closures, reductions in undergraduate course offerings and the elimination of program minors. A 2009 budget document revealed that 30 half-year courses taught by sessional faculty had already been eliminated in the Faculty of Social Sciences, and another 71 were slated to be cut in 2010 (CUPE 2009b). Future research is needed to determine if these kinds of austerity measures have continued and to assess the impact on faculty hiring.

¹²⁵ The economic downturn did have a marginal impact on some universities' endowments, pension funds and operating budgets.

An Emerging Three-Tiered Academic Hierarchy

According to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, the number of full-time faculty in Canada declined in the 1990s (AUCC 2007a). These reductions were achieved through a combination of retirement incentive programs and constraints on replacing retired professors with similar full-time positions. In contrast, the number of full-time faculty increased by over 20 percent between 1998 and 2006, largely as a result of additional tenure stream hiring. In fact, the AUCC claims that the number of full-time contract faculty in Canada has remained proportionally small and relatively unchanged since the mid-1970s and that “there is no indication that Canadian universities typically use these contractual arrangements to meet hiring requirements” (p. 24).

Generally speaking, these claims are not supported by my data. At some universities, such as Brock, Nipissing, Queen’s, Lakehead and Toronto, the number of full-time contract faculty did remain relatively stable.¹²⁶ At most institutions, however, the number and proportion of full-time contact faculty increased significantly. At Waterloo, for example, the number of full-time sessionals in the Faculty of Arts rose from just two in 2000 to 20 in 2005, while only six tenure stream professors were hired. At Wilfrid Laurier, full-time contract positions in the Faculty of Arts increased from six in 2000-01 to 30 in 2008-09, which was a much greater proportional increase compared with tenure stream hiring. A similar pattern was found at Western, where the number of full sessionals in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities and the Faculty of Social Science rose by 229 percent between 2001-02 and 2010-11 (from 14 to 46 positions). In contrast,

¹²⁶ Brock, Queen’s and Lakehead employ few full-time sessionals in relation to tenure stream faculty. Toronto’s reliance on full contract hires is significantly higher; its ratio of tenured/tenure track faculty to full-time contract appointments in the Faculty of Arts and Science was 8.8, which is an above average intensity for my sample.

44 tenure/tenure track positions were added during this period, which represents an increase of 15 percent. As a result, the ratio of tenure stream faculty to full-time sessionals at Western (or full-time intensity ratio) declined from an average of 16 between 2000-01 and 2002-03, to 7.7 for the remainder of the decade. At UOIT, full-time contract positions across all faculties increased from 10 to 54 between 2003 and 2010. Again, this was larger than the proportional increase in tenure stream hiring. Compared with other universities, UOIT relies heavily on full-time contract faculty. Over this period, the university employed just three tenure stream faculty for every full-time sessional.

At other institutions, the data reveal a trend where the number of full-time sessionals increased sharply for much of the decade, only to decline in subsequent years. This pattern was the case at York, Carleton, Windsor, Trent and McMaster. Looking specifically at Trent, the number of full sessionals rose from 20 to 58 between 2002 and 2007. Although this number declined to 44 by 2010, it still represented a 120 percent increase over the decade. And because a similar rise and fall occurred for tenure stream hiring, Trent's full-time intensity ratio fell from an average of 5.6 between 2000 and 2005, to 3.4 between 2006 and 2010. Like UOIT, Trent relies heavily on full-time sessionals, at least in social sciences and humanities. Similarly, at McMaster, the number of full-time contract faculty in the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Social Sciences rose from 27 in 2001 to 53 in 2006; at the same time, its full-time intensity ratio fell from 7.9 to 4.4. By 2009, however, this ratio had climbed back up to 6.5.¹²⁷

¹²⁷ The decline in full-time contract positions was especially prominent in the faculty of Social Sciences, where the number of positions dropped from 31 in 2006 to 14 in 2009.

At Ottawa, Laurentian, Guelph and Nipissing, similar hiring patterns were observed but with one key difference; the decline in full-time sessional hiring late in the decade was matched by increases in tenured/tenure track hiring. For example, in the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Social Sciences at Ottawa, the number of full-time sessionals increased nearly six-fold between 2000 and 2008, or from 11 to 64 positions. This 482 percent increase was much higher than the 41 percent increase in tenure stream hiring. However, the number of full sessionals declined by 25 from 2008 to 2010, while the number of tenure stream positions increased by 50. Similarly, full-time sessional hiring in the Faculty of Arts and Science at Nipissing increased from 14 in 2000-01 to 44 in 2008-09. This represents a 214 percent increase compared with the 83 percent increase observed for tenured/tenure track faculty. Yet, from 2008-09 to 2009-10, the number of full sessionals dropped from 44 to 31, while the number of tenure stream faculty continued to increase. It should also be noted that Nipissing's reliance on full-time sessionals was the highest of any university in my sample. Over the decade, its intensity ratio in the Faculty of Arts and Science was just 2.38. In fact, Nipissing's actual ratio is likely even lower because these numbers do not include those full-time instructors represented by the CASBU union. Finally, it is worth noting that Ryerson ran counter to this trend. While the number of full sessionals at Ryerson remained relatively constant until 2008, these hires nearly tripled from 13 in 2008 to 35 in 2010. As noted above, this may be a result of some part-timers moving into full-time sessional positions.

Considering these data as a whole, there has been a large increase in the number and proportion of full-time contract faculty in the faculties and departments under review. At most institutions, I was able to identify two overarching trends: (i) the percentage

increases in full-time sessional hires were greater – often much greater – than those observed for tenure stream faculty, and (ii) the ratio of tenure stream faculty to contract faculty declined. Across all 18 institutions, the number of full-time contract faculty increased by 59 percent between 2002-03 and 2008-09, while the number of tenured/tenure track faculty increased by 25 percent. These figures suggest that contrary to the AUCC’s claims, universities *are* using these contractual arrangements to meet hiring requirements.¹²⁸ Similar to the changes related to part-time contract hiring, however, there was a noticeable decline in full sessional hiring toward the end of the decade. In fact, the number of full-time sessionals fell by 16.6 percent between 2008-09 and 2009-10 alone. As noted above, it is possible that such changes reflect a shift in the policies of some institutions toward (re)-investing in tenure track positions or converting full sessionals to the tenure stream.¹²⁹ Once again, however, it must be emphasized that these reductions were *not* matched by significant increases in tenure stream hiring; across all 18 institutions, tenure stream positions rose by just 0.7 between 2008-09 and 2009-10. This slight upturn suggests that the primary explanation is likely related to the impact of the economic crisis and university austerity programs.¹³⁰

¹²⁸ My findings align with those of Louise Desjardins (2012), who reports that the proportion of tenured/tenure track positions for doctorate holders working full-time in Canadian universities declined significantly between 1981 and 2007. Similarly, Jones et al (2012) note that the rate of growth for full-time contract positions in Canada was significantly higher than that of tenure stream positions between 2000 and 2008.

¹²⁹ For example, when I inquired about these changes at Guelph, I was informed that the decline in the number of full sessional appointments in the College of Arts reflected an increase in the number of tenure track faculty appointed, as well as the conversion of longer-serving contractually limited faculty to tenure track positions.

¹³⁰ Further, as Martin Finkelstein (2007) has argued, although full-time contract faculty in Canada more closely resemble their tenure stream colleagues in terms of qualifications (approximately three in four full-time sessionals hold PhDs in Canada compared with one in two in the US), they have no more success in moving into tenure track positions than their US counterparts.

Although full-time or “regularized” contract positions can offer improvements for employees in terms of greater job security and employment benefits, they are not the first choice of employment for most aspiring academics nor do they offer an adequate long-term solution to the problems associated with contract employment. For example, research has found that the work of full-time contract faculty in Canadian universities is characterized by “heavier teaching loads, insecurity caused by contract status, little input into or control over teaching assignments, lack of time for research, relegation of their research role, and their consequent devaluation as ‘teaching-only’ faculty” (Rajagopal 2004: 62). Notwithstanding the decline in full-time sessional hiring late in the decade, my data suggest that a distinct “third tier” of academic labour made up largely of these full-time contract positions has taken shape in Ontario. This middle tier represents a parallel alternative to the tenure system, where a growing number of limited-term academics occupy a stratum just above that of part-timers in the academic hierarchy.

Conclusions: The Future of University Hiring

For my final 11 ATIs, I requested information on university hiring plans for all three categories of academic staff. With respect to contract hiring, not one institution responded with any kind of detailed plan, and most stipulated that contract instructors were hired on a “just-in-time” basis in response to enrolment trends or to maintain institutional flexibility. For this reason, contract hiring was deemed by the respondents to be “impossible to forecast,” to borrow from the remarks of one administrator. Despite these claims, the 2007 Multi-Year Accountability Agreement signed between the Ontario government and Ontario universities indicates that this kind of planning does exist (see

OCUFA 2010b). The agreement states that almost one quarter of *planned* university hiring involves “contract, part-time or sessional” academic staff, a significant increase over previous years. It also states that without increased public investments in higher education, universities will be forced to reduce educational quality by hiring more part-time faculty.

Most universities also stated that they had no definitive plans for tenure stream hiring. At Ryerson, Lakehead, Laurentian, Wilfrid Laurier and Windsor, I was told there were no hiring plans whatsoever. For example, the information coordinator at Windsor was informed by the university’s Provost that the official policy was to no longer forecast faculty hiring because of budgetary cutbacks and financial uncertainty. At Trent, a senior administrator told me that the university had no current hiring plan but would “hopefully” be developing one soon. UOIT refused even to respond to this portion of the request and invoked an exemption under section 18.01 of the FIPPA, which allows the university to withhold information for “plans relating to the management of personnel or the administration of an institution that have not yet been put into operation or made public.” On the other hand, a few universities did provide hiring information. The coordinator at Waterloo stated that the Faculty of Arts was “interested” in hiring 20 tenure track faculty over the next three years, although the university had no official plan. At Western, I was directed to a budget document that provided limited information about planned hires by faculty. At McMaster, I was instructed that the Faculty of Humanities was planning to hire 24 tenure stream positions over the next three years, which was interesting given that the number of tenure stream appointments in this faculty had remained virtually unchanged during the 2000s. In the end, Nipissing was the only university to provide a

detailed list of planned hires in each department within the Faculty of Arts and Science. Overall, the university's goal was to add 15 new tenure track positions between 2011-12 and 2015-16. To its credit, a key component of Nipissing's plan was to convert limited-term appointments into tenure track positions.

This lack of institutional planning around – or willingness to share information about – faculty hiring is troublesome for several reasons. For one, the Ontario student body is expected to increase by 27 percent between 2008 and 2021, and this change is already fueling demand for new courses, programs and faculty (OCUFA 2010b). Moreover, even with the abolition of mandatory retirement in Canada, retirements in the university sector will continue to intensify hiring demands in the next decade(s). The lack of priority afforded to tenure stream hiring also runs counter to the stated interests of Ontario faculty, 63 percent of which assert that the *first* priority for any new funding should be to hire and retain full-time tenure track faculty (OCUFA 2012b). Currently, however, full-time faculty are being replaced with a similar full-time hire in less than 60 percent of all cases (OCUFA 2009b), and these contracted faculty continue to work in tenuous and financially difficult conditions. To be sure, thousands of new faculty positions will be created in the coming decades. The question is whether these positions will include a high proportion of stable, full-time tenure stream positions, or whether they will consist primarily of limited-term appointments and precarious, part-time contract positions. Under corporatization, my research suggests that casualization will continue to dominate university hiring practices in Ontario, and elsewhere in the Canadian academy. Further discussion about the unique data collected for this study, and the consequences and future research directions it suggests, will be included in the concluding chapter. In

the next chapter, we move onto another change in higher education under the corporatization agenda that is connected to the changing composition of academic labour: the rise of the student consumer.

Chapter Six: The Rise of the Student-Consumer

The last two chapters looked specifically at the impact of corporatization on university teaching and academic labour. This chapter builds on this analysis by exploring how the process of university restructuring is impacting students, including their goals and values, educational choices, learning experiences, finances, career prospects and relationship with the university. The chapter is organized into two main sections. The first opens with a brief introduction to the longstanding debate over liberal education versus vocational training in the university and how the terms of this debate have shifted under corporatization. I then analyze the transformation of students into educational consumers, focusing on the emergent “student-consumer” model of higher learning that has taken shape in recent years. The second section offers a more empirical examination of the shifting political economy of student life. Several interrelated issues are explored, including the occurrence and impacts of rising tuition fees and student debt, student aid and employment trends, university access, and the differences in national and provincial higher education policies and programs.

Liberal Education, Vocational Training and the Rise of the Student-Consumer

John Henry Newman (1852) is often credited for drawing the classic distinction between liberal education and vocational training in the university. Newman argued that the ideals of liberal education were opposed to the principles of practicality and utility. The proper object of university study, therefore, was not “useful” knowledge but the unity of

knowledge, or the creation of an intellectual culture. In addition to nurturing a range of mental capacities – intellectual curiosity and engagement, creativity, wisdom and sound judgment – Newman claimed that the pursuit of knowledge carried its own intrinsic importance, or that the process of “coming to know” was valuable in and of itself. This seminal idea has since been a cornerstone of liberal education philosophy.

For Newman, liberal education trained a person in such a way that he or she would be prepared for any professional, vocational or practical activity (in this sense, at least, he viewed liberal education as “useful”).¹³¹ Similarly, John Stuart Mill argued that university education should not impart individuals with professional knowledge “but that which should direct the use of their professional knowledge, and bring the light of general culture to illuminate the technicalities of a special pursuit” (cited in Fulton 1986: 240). Following this, Mill insisted that professional training should remain separate from the university.¹³² A related perspective is found in the writings of Wilhelm von Humboldt, one of the founders of the modern research university, who argued that universities must remain separate from other institutions of learning and “particularly from the various practical ones” (see von Humboldt 1963: 133). Much of this thinking is

¹³¹ For many early advocates of liberal education like Newman, the defence of the university was religiously motivated. And until recently, the benefits of liberal education were available only to a select group of financially privileged men. Further, as Axelrod (2002) explains, unlike contemporary academics who praise the virtues of critical thinking, many of their predecessors were more interested in cultivating “piousness, patriotism, respectability, and intellectual conformity to dominant ideas” (p. 38). Today, Newman’s “ideal” has been secularized and divorced from its grounding in Christianity, and the benefits of liberal education have been expanded to include more diverse social groups. According to Axelrod, the ideals of liberal education now include the cultivation of “intellectual creativity, autonomy, and resilience; critical thinking; a combination of intellectual breadth and specialized knowledge; the comprehension and tolerance of diverse ideas and experiences; informed participation in community life; and effective communication skills” (34-35).

¹³² In his 1867 inaugural lecture as rector of St. Andrew’s University, Mill states: “There is tolerable agreement about what a university is not. It is not a place of professional education ... Their object is not to make skillful lawyers and physicians or engineers, but capable and cultivated human beings” (cited in Tombs and Whyte 2003: 15-16).

also echoed in the writing of Thorstein Veblen (1918) who, as noted in Chapter 2, argued that practical education was a contradiction in terms and a euphemism for private gain. He equated the expansion of vocational programs in US universities with deliberate business campaigns to dispense with courses of study that were not conducive to wealth creation. To varying degrees, each of these writers sought to keep vocational interests separate from the university's mission, but they all agreed, or at least acknowledged, that liberal education could direct or inform vocational and professional pursuits.¹³³

Others have argued otherwise, stating that the integration of liberal education and vocational training, including within a university setting, provides educational and social benefits. Former Harvard professor Alfred North Whitehead (1967: 51), for one, claimed that higher learning required “first-hand knowledge,” or an explicit connection between the mind and “material creative activity.” For Whitehead, sound thinking and practical or manual competencies were not merely complimentary but mutually necessary. In a similar vein, Bertrand Russell (1932: 156-157) criticized liberal education's over-emphasis on “book learning” and its tendency to equate “idleness” with elegance or virtue. Although pure learning had a place in the university, Russell contended that most people were better served by an education that supplemented liberal learning with some form of “practical utility.” C. Wright Mills (1956) also advocated an integrated form of higher learning. While Mills recognized that practical skills-training was very different from liberal education's emphasis on values and self-development, he understood that

¹³³ Robert Wolff (1969) has also argued that professional training should take place outside the university. Professional education, in his view, destroyed the unity of the academic community by re-orientating professors' activities to outside interests. Wolff insisted that there was an inherent contradiction between professional certification – concerned with a demonstrated mastery of texts and skills – and the “intellectual, emotional, and moral interaction through which a student learns from a professor what it is to be a creative intellect” (p. 23).

skills and values operated on a continuum and were not discrete entities. The middle range of this continuum – what he called “sensibilities” – was particularly vital to the educational mission (p. 318). For Mills, sensibilities emerged through the integration of liberal learning and practical training, and could be a source of intellectual and social liberation for the general population.

The advantages of synthesizing liberal and vocational education were also articulated by John Dewey. Although he was critical of capitalism, Dewey argued that universities should not operate in absentia of the outside world, including the world of business. In his words, “while there is no guarantee that an education which uses science and employs the controlled process of industry ... will succeed, there is every assurance that an educational practice which sets science and industry in opposition to its ideal of culture will fail” (Dewey 1964: 293).¹³⁴ Following this line of reasoning, Dewey claimed that many common educational distinctions (e.g., between theory and practice, culture and utility, fine and industrial art) were false dichotomies. He argued that these dichotomies existed, in part, because of social inequality, especially the separation of people into “leisure” and “labouring” classes. Thus, it was unjust social conditions that accounted for “the narrowly disciplinary or cultural character of most higher education ... the tendency to isolate intellectual matters till knowledge is scholastic, academic, and professionally technical, and for the widespread conviction that liberal education is opposed to the requirements of an education which shall count in the vocations of life”

¹³⁴ According to Dewey, a key goal of educational reform should be to “humanize” education and industry in order to “subdue the industrial machinery to human ends” (p. 293). While Dewey recognized that vocational and professional programs were becoming more prominent in higher education, he was less inclined than Velben to attribute this development to purposeful business campaigns: “Not conscious intent, either perverse or wise, is forcing the realistic, the practical, the industrial, into education” (Dewey 1964: 292). Rather, these trends emerged “like destiny” from the forces of industrialization.

(Dewey 1966: 136). For Dewey, then, a key task for educators was to break down these dualisms. Like Mills, Dewey saw potential in integrating liberal education and practical training to reduce social inequalities and produce free and self-educating publics. In part, their arguments were based on the belief that universities can and should be involved in contemporary issues and struggles, including struggles in the workplace. As Dewey explained it, education that acknowledges the “full intellectual and social meaning” of technical vocations can help workers to become “masters of their industrial fate” (p. 318). Of course, Dewey also recognized that many vocational programs had the effect of strengthening social inequality.

As this brief introduction suggests, it has been customary to distinguish between liberal education and vocational training in the university. This distinction centres around two different – though not necessarily competing – visions of higher education: one that prioritizes intellectual self-development and one that focuses on the virtues of practical skills training. Today, the terrain of this debate has shifted, so that arguments in favour of vocational training in higher education are increasingly divorced from Mills’ notion of “sensibilities,” or Dewey’s goal of empowering workers. As universities are transformed in the interests of corporate power, calls for practical and vocational “relevance” have become virtually synonymous with efforts to streamline programs and downplay the university’s emphasis on liberal learning. Related to this, a growing chorus of criticism holds that the ideals of a liberal education are no longer sufficient to prepare graduates for the workforce. According to Patrick Keeney (2011), liberal education in Canada is “being eroded and undermined, if not deliberately bulldozed, in the name of a reckless, unrelenting economic pragmatism.” In its place, Canadian universities are adopting

“industrial utilitarianism” as their chief operating principle, where the only learning that is considered worthwhile is professional, applied or vocational.¹³⁵

Supporters of these restructuring efforts point to a number of perceived benefits, including those incurred directly by students. They argue that market-oriented curriculum reform has led to a greater symmetry between university education and the needs of employers, where industry sponsored courses, work placement programs, business internships and corporate funded research projects have provided students with hands-on technical training and experience that expands the relevance of their skills and competitiveness in the job market. Corporations, in turn, profit from these arrangements through an increase in the quality and stock of their “human capital.” Consistent with this ethos, recent federal policy changes in Canada have provided support to enhance university-business alliances through student placements. As part of the 2012 federal Budget, for example, \$14 million was earmarked to help graduate students obtain internships in the private sector, with the goal of doubling the number of students in the existing work placement program. Under corporatization more generally, governments and university administrators have shifted university resources away from arts-related disciplines toward business, engineering and the applied sciences to support business-minded objectives.

These shifting institutional priorities are part of a larger effort to rationalize the benefits of higher education according to economic criteria. Under corporatization, then, the division between liberal and vocational education has widened. The first is framed as

¹³⁵ Publications like Stanley’s Aronowitz’s *The Knowledge Factory* (2000) and Alan Sears’ *Retooling the Mind Factory* (2003) illustrate how schools and universities are ostensibly abandoning their commitment to critical and transformative education in favour of rote training.

useless and impractical and the latter as a prized educational ideal. Moreover, positioning higher education as labour market training serves to justify many of the changes that are occurring under corporatization, such as cutbacks in public funding, and rising tuition and student debt. In my view, the shift to rely on narrow, vocational criteria to define the public university's role has been associated with a range of negative implications for students. Most notably, it has helped to transform students into educational consumers – or as customers purchasing a service or private good – who are encouraged to extract maximum “value” for their tuition dollars. The remainder of this section addresses how redefining students as educational consumers – with similar roles, rights and obligations to customers in the private marketplace – has changed the way that universities relate to their “customers,” as well as the ways in which students view learning, knowledge production and their relationship to the university.

Educating the Student-Consumer

University students are increasingly being targeted by corporations who lease space on university campuses to advertise their goods and services. According to Giroux and Giroux (2004: 233), “almost every aspect of public space in higher education is now designed to attract students as consumers and shoppers.” As public universities are transformed into “hyper-commercialized spaces,” students encounter a “marketplace of logos rather than ideas” and are inundated with the message that the most important identity available to them is that of the consuming subject. Put another way, today's colleges and universities are offering students a “hidden extracurricular course of instruction in consumption capitalism” (Slaughter and Rhoades 2004: 19). One of the most obvious indicators of this new student-consumer identity came when two US high

school graduates – Chris Barrett and Luke McCabe – offered themselves as “walking billboards” for any corporation willing to pay their tuition. The students advertised that they would “put corporate logos on their clothes, wear a company’s sunglasses, use their golf clubs, eat their pizza, drink their soda, listen to their music or drive their cars” (Giroux 2002: 426).

While it is not surprising that corporate leaders tend to view students as workers and consumers in training, the extent to which public universities have embraced this same logic is. Reduced public funding and a greater reliance on tuition revenues have led many institutions to fixate on customer-service, customer satisfaction and “product quality” (Eastman 2007). This service orientation is often explicit in university planning documents. For example, the *Report of the Steering Committee on Resource Optimization* at the University of Ottawa (2010: 51, 53) recommends that the university should “develop a strategic approach to monitoring and improving student satisfaction” in both “academic and non-academic services.” It goes on to say that measurement strategies to gauge student (customer) satisfaction should include “Phantom Shopper style assessments” and the use of social networking sites such as Facebook and Twitter. Developing a service culture within the university also necessitates the incorporation of customer service performance measures into staff evaluations and the use of “client satisfaction data.” As universities employ marketing narratives to guide their relationship with students, it is only logical that students would also incorporate a consumerist model in their relationship with the university. In fact, cross-national research has shown that students who participate in heavily corporatized education systems manifest consumerist attitudes to a greater extent (e.g., Pritchard 2005). The corporatization of Canadian

universities, in concert with broader changes in Canada's political culture, has likewise produced a more narrow, consumerist orientation on the part of university students.

Various results obtained through survey data are one indicator of this transformation.

Surveying the Surveys: The Growing Importance of Money and Jobs

According to a sample of US surveys, recent student cohorts are more materialistic in general and tend to view the linkages between education and employment in instrumental terms. Although not indifferent to the economic value of higher learning, students in earlier generations were more willing to endorse values of social engagement and self-development in education. One specific indicator of this shift is the change associated with two contrasting values: (i) "developing a meaningful philosophy of life," and (ii) "being very well off financially." In the late 1960s, the first value was endorsed as an important goal by over 80 percent of US college freshmen, with the second lagging behind at 45 percent. By the early 1990s, however, the importance attached to these values had essentially traded places, with financial motivations assuming the top rank (Astin 1998, 2000).¹³⁶ In 2011, the proportion of students who reported that being well off financially was an important life goal was the highest since the freshmen survey began in 1966 (Pryor et al. 2011). These results have been replicated by Levine and Dean's (2012) longitudinal analysis of US student survey data.

Canadian surveys reveal a similar, if less dramatic, trend. In the 1980s, student motivations for attending university were remarkably consistent. Their responses reflected a dual motivation – intellectual development and job preparation – and there

¹³⁶ Over the same period, the proportion of students who agreed that the "chief benefit of a college education is to increase one's earning power" increased from 54 percent to 71 percent, while the proportion who were attending college "to be able to make more money" increased from one half to three quarters.

was no clear priority given to either objective. At Dalhousie, for example, 82 percent of first-year students reported that they were attending university to become a more educated person, while an equal percentage were motivated by occupational considerations. Likewise, York students gave equal weight to enhancing career prospects and furthering their own intellectual development. At the University of Toronto, four out of five incoming students said that “getting a good job” was an important reason for attending university, a figure matched by the number who mentioned personal or intellectual interests (Gilbert et al 1997). In British Columbia, the proportion of individuals citing better job opportunities as their main reason for valuing university education was only marginally higher than the proportion that prioritized the acquisition of knowledge for its own sake (Shrimpton 1987).

As corporatization accelerated in Canada, student values began to change. One recent study found that 63 percent of students at a mid-sized Canadian university reported that the most important reason for attending university was to obtain a good job or achieve a particular career goal, while only 10 percent indicated that they wanted to obtain an education to “better themselves” (Singleton-Jackson, Jackson and Reinhardt 2010). According to data from the Canadian University Survey Consortium, 67 percent of first-year students in 2010 chose “preparing for a specific job or career” or “getting a good job” as the most important reason for attending university; nine percent indicated that “getting a good general education” was the most important reason; and eight percent chose “increasing my knowledge in an academic field” (Prairie Research Associates 2004, 2010). Similarly, a study by the Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission (2008) found that 45 percent of students cited the acquisition of relevant job skills as the

most important reason for attending university. In contrast, higher order goals such as increased knowledge and broadening one's understanding of the world received just 13 and 12 percent respectively. In a 2010 study of Canadian university applicants, 99 percent indicated that their reasons for applying to university included "career preparation" or "career advancement," while only three quarters of applicants indicated that their motivations also included "personal or intellectual growth" or "increasing knowledge." Just one third cited a desire to "give back to society" (Steele 2010).¹³⁷

University Enrolments

Not surprisingly, the growing importance attached to career and monetary advancement has changed the way that different academic programs are viewed. Students who are primarily concerned with money or job-related skills are less likely to be interested in courses that prioritize critical thinking or self-development. Good value for one's tuition dollars means purchasing courses labelled as relevant in market terms. As Jennie Hornosty (2004: 51) has argued, students who come into university with a corporate mindset "will choose only courses and programs that they believe have an 'exchange value' in the market place."

Student values and attitudes both reflect and have reinforced changing enrolment trends. A shift in university enrolments from basic arts and sciences to more practical fields of study was evident by the late 1970s (Axelrod 1982a). Between 1967-68 and 1977-78, the proportion of Canadian undergraduates registered in arts and science programs fell from 58 to 47 percent, while enrolment in business administration nearly doubled. Likewise, from 1976 to 1981, the number of bachelor degrees awarded in

¹³⁷ According to Richard Wellen (2005), students who adopt a market orientation to higher learning are less likely to participate in political and community activities and display lower levels of civic engagement.

commerce, engineering and computer science increased by 39 percent, at the same time as “public sector-oriented degrees” in fields like education, the humanities and social sciences declined from 72 to 64 percent (Novek 1985: 191). These changes continued in subsequent years. The number of students enrolled in “liberal arts and sciences, the social sciences, English and history” all declined significantly in the mid-1990s, a trend that was reinforced by changing public attitudes (AUCC 2011a: 8).¹³⁸ One survey during this period found that a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree was considered to be the most valuable type of education by only 3 percent of the population (Axelrod 1998: 11). A high school education with “lots of on-the-job-training” ranked higher than a BA, and more than one third of respondents said that a “college diploma in a technical occupation” was the most valuable.

Although enrolment growth in arts-related disciplines rebounded in the late 1990s and 2000s, it did not match the expansion of business and management fields. According to Statistics Canada, between 1997-98 and 2003-04, humanities enrolment increased by 14.4 percent while enrolment in business, management and public administration increased by 37.1 percent (Statistics Canada 2005). Between 2005-06 and 2008-09, growth in these same disciplines increased by 3.8 percent and 12.2 percent respectively (Statistics Canada 2010c). From 1997 to 2007, the largest proportional increase in university graduates was in business, management and public administration; by the end of this 10-year period, the most popular program for full-time undergraduate students in Canada was business and management (AUCC 2011a; Statistics Canada 2009c).

¹³⁸ The change was particularly evident at some institutions. At the University of Calgary, for example, the number of students enrolled in education, fine arts, humanities and social sciences all declined during the 1990s, while those enrolled in engineering and management increased by 58 and 61 percent respectively (Phillips and Hughes 2004).

Although liberal arts fields continue to attract a considerable proportion of Canadian students, there has been a discernible shift towards vocational and business-related degrees.

Learning as a Service Encounter

Changes in student motivations and their enrollment patterns correspond to broader changes that have taken place in line with corporatization. Intentionally or otherwise, student-consumers have helped to transform broader pedagogical relationships to comply with market frameworks. This idea informs a growing literature that equates higher education with a passive commercial transaction, rather than an active process of mutual engagement on the part of student and professor (Marks 2007; Naidoo and Jamieson 2005). In the corporatized university, learning has been refashioned as a *service encounter*. In this context, many students have adopted a sort of “degree purchasing” orientation, where educational credentials are viewed as purchasable commodities and learning is evaluated according to external motivations and rewards. James Côté and Anton Allahar (2011) point to some of the negative consequences of this orientation to student learning, including professor disengagement and the rise of a more adversarial classroom environment. Céleste Brotheridge and Raymond Lee (2005) also note some of its detrimental impacts, including “poor study habits, the use of resistance strategies in the classroom, low positive affect, and poor course performance” (p. 71).

Consistent with the notion of degree purchasing today, students also tend to have a new and specific set of entitlements. In a just society, everyone should be entitled to a university education. Under corporatization, however, student entitlement has taken on pejorative connotations associated with consumer privilege. Many students now believe

that their status as educational consumers, and as part of the broader consumer culture, affords them the right to demand what their education should entail. Research has shown, for example, that students increasingly expect the same things from universities as they do from commercial establishments, such as convenience, customer-centred service and product guarantees (Singleton-Jackson, Jackson and Reinhardt 2010; Molesworth, Nixon and Scullion 2009; White 2007).¹³⁹ As universities continue to broaden their customer service mandate, university professors – recast as “service providers” – are expected to provide a learning environment that is conducive to customer satisfaction. Accordingly, student consumerism has been linked to the well documented phenomenon of grade inflation. If student satisfaction is the responsibility of the service provider, there is considerable incentive for the provider to inflate grades in order to please the customer. In a survey of faculty at the University of Western Ontario, Côté and Allahar (2011) found widespread agreement that today’s students expected higher grades for putting out the same or less effort than in the past. Moreover, 90 percent of faculty said they felt pressure to give higher grades than students deserved, and a majority admitted that they had recently changed their courses to make them easier for students. Although these results cannot be generalized, it would appear that many professors are aware of, and are catering to, student-consumer expectations.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁹ The University of Regina recently set the bar for “product guarantees” when it became the first university in Canada to guarantee career success. The “UR Guarantee Program” stipulates that all students who complete the program (which includes mandatory job-training seminars) are assured a job within six months of graduation. If students are unable to secure employment within that time, the university provides them with an additional year of undergraduate education free of charge.

¹⁴⁰ According to Woodhouse (2009), student course evaluations also embody market values and are closely tied to the university’s customer service mandate. In his view, a key problem with these evaluations is that they have been shown to gauge student attitudes towards their professors, rather than teaching quality or the amount of learning that has taken place. This systematic design flaw has encouraged the perception that professors should assume a service provider role.

Some student-consumers go further, claiming they are entitled to educational rewards regardless of their performance in the classroom. From this perspective, receiving high grades (and ultimately a degree) is an entitlement paid for by tuition fees.¹⁴¹ It follows that universities are obligated to provide students not simply with opportunities for academic success, but with *realized* academic success. In fact, some students are even appealing to judicial systems as a way to enforce their consumer rights (Brulé 2004). Students and parents in many US states, for example, are drawing on consumerist arguments to launch “educational malpractice” lawsuits (Steele 2010). Similar cases have arisen in Canada. In 2012, a political science student at Concordia launched a lawsuit against the university after receiving an unexpected grade. Seeking reimbursement for the \$342 course fee, he stated that the credential was a “product they sold me for \$342 and ... they haven’t adhered to the terms of the service, so I just asked for a refund” (cited in Johnson 2012).

Academic Dishonesty as Market Response

The rise of the student-consumer has also been associated with other consequences, such as a documented increase in academic dishonesty. Research in the US indicates that “cheating” has become far more prevalent among higher education students.

Summarizing this literature, Colleen Vojak (2006: 178) argues that students’ “academic moral compasses” have undergone a profound shift as they “increasingly connect their educational experiences to ‘career, money, and success.’” Similarly, a UK survey of over 80 universities found that academic misconduct has increased dramatically in recent

¹⁴¹ The idea that tuition fees are simply a means to purchase a degree was reflected in a statement by York University administrators following the 2008 strike. According to the administration, students would not get a refund for lost class time because their tuition was “paying for credits,” and those credits would be delivered (cited in Shipley 2009).

years (Barret 2011). This finding is supported by researchers at Manchester University, who found that over half of the students they surveyed were willing to cheat by turning in papers purchased off the internet.¹⁴² In Canada, “cheating, deceit, and plagiarism” have also become more commonplace on university campuses (Birchard 2006). According to one study, over half of undergraduates and 35 percent of graduate students admitted to some form of academic misconduct. In fact, academic dishonesty has become so prevalent that a Montreal-based company, known as unemployedprofessors.com, is openly hiring academics and graduate students to write custom essays for students (Seidman 2012).

Some have argued that the documented rise in academic dishonesty can be viewed as a rational response on the part of the student-consumer (e.g., Saltmarsh 2004). The rationale is that cheating conforms to the logic of the marketplace and a commodified educational environment. Vojak (2006: 190) notes that the attitudes of students who engage in academic misconduct mirror market principles as both use “a value system in which economic goods are prioritized, success is quantified, self-interest is narrowly defined, personal benefits are accrued by shifting costs onto others and appearances of virtue are more profitable than real virtue.” Instrumentalizing higher learning as a means to an end also alienates students from the process and product of their labour, which results in increased incentives to take shortcuts to obtain the end goal. As academic dishonesty is reframed as a viable alternative to effort and engagement, it is understandable why a growing number of university students do not understand why plagiarism is wrong (Levine and Dean 2012). The use of market ideologies by

¹⁴² This readiness to engage in plagiarism is fuelling the UK’s online essay industry, estimated to be worth over £200 million (Henry 2010).

universities makes them complicit in the production of an educational climate where academic dishonesty is seen as a rational and enterprising strategy. In John McMurtry's (2010: 23) words, "if the academy follows market values, why shouldn't students buy their papers from sellers of their choice? ... The rising epidemic of Internet plagiarism is not anomalous, but symptomatic of the increasing dominance of market values in the academy."

The Student-Consumer Paradox

For proponents of corporatization, the transformation of students into educational consumers is a positive development that addresses the demands of neoliberal restructuring (e.g., accountability, efficiency and relevance). Missing from this perspective is an understanding of the fundamental differences between a customer-supplier and a student-university relationship that make the former an inappropriate substitute for the latter (Ng and Forbes 2009; Svensson and Wood 2007). For example, just as educational "services" are different from other services, the normative expectations, rights and obligations of students are different from those of traditional customers. Some of these differences can be explained using market terminology, as follows: (i) unlike traditional customers, educational "consumers" must commit considerable effort to co-producing the product with the service provider; (ii) unlike a corporation, the university has an obligation to assess how a customer "uses" its product before allowing more of the product to be purchased and consumed; (iii) unlike a corporation, which sells its products to anyone with the ability to pay, money alone cannot (or, at least, should not) allow one to obtain a university degree; and (iv) unlike the ideal of customer assurance in a market context (i.e., "the customer is always right"),

the notion of customer assurance is antithetical to the contingent process of educational discovery. Thus, applying market principles to education inappropriately compartmentalizes the educational experience as a product rather than a process, and has a distancing effect on students by reducing their status to non-participants in the course of their educational development.

It is important to note, however, that the rise of the student-consumer is a contested process. Many students still desire (and receive) a rich and challenging university education that is not solely linked to monetary rewards or job preparation. Yet, as the corporatization process accelerates and the costs of higher education and student debt continue to rise, more and more students are identifying as customers. In the remainder of the chapter, I present an empirical examination of broader university trends and policies that have contributed to this shift in student identity.

Customers Pay: Tuition, Debt and the High Cost of Learning

In 2010, the coalition government in the UK announced that university tuition fees would be allowed to rise by nearly 300 percent to a maximum of £9000, ostensibly as a way to compensate for public funding cuts. Critics of this fee increase have warned that these measures will significantly alter higher education in the UK, especially in England.¹⁴³ In the area of employment, for example, a “conservative” estimate by the University and College Union found that more than 22,000 academic and non-academic jobs in English

¹⁴³ Most universities in England currently charge the maximum £9,000 in fees (or very close to it). Moreover, nearly three quarters of all institutions have announced that they will charge the full amount for some or all of their courses by 2014-15. As a result, the average fee level is expected to rise to approximately £8,650 per year (Coughlan 2013).

universities will be lost as a result.¹⁴⁴ The Union also predicts that student to staff ratios will grow to some of the highest in the developed world (BBC News 2010). Another area of concern is access. Shortly after the changes were announced, a poll by Ipsos MORI found that the fee increase would lead to a “dramatic fall” in the diversity of students attending university, with some estimating that student applicants from poorer families could be reduced by as much as two thirds (Williams and Vasagar 2010). In response, legal experts have asserted that allowing public universities to charge these kinds of fees is contrary to human rights law (Vasagar 2010).¹⁴⁵ Predictably, university applications and enrolments in England have already declined (Blackstock 2012; Ellis 2012; Paton 2011a). One poll found that two thirds of young people personally knew someone who decided not to apply because of increased costs and/or concerns about future debt (Morrison and Brady 2011). Another study found that students starting university in 2012 can expect to graduate with debt loads averaging £60,000 (Paton 2011b); when interest charges on student loans and other fees are considered, the true cost of a university degree will increase up to £100,000 (Gallagher 2012). Traditional arts and humanities departments have experienced the greatest decline in enrolments. Over the past five years, demand for disciplines such as English, history, languages and philosophy has fallen significantly, while demand for business-related programs has increased (Paton

¹⁴⁴ According to Koos Couvée (2012), graduate and post-graduate student teachers – most of them working on short-term contracts – are already being pressured to work for free to help cut costs, a practice Couvée likens to “slave labour.”

¹⁴⁵ In response to concerns about university access, some universities have introduced “no frills” degree programs. In these programs, full-time students pay only half the tuition fees but are restricted in their use of many university facilities. Hannah Blackstock (2012) likens this approach to “no frills airlines;” where students have to “upgrade” if they “want to use the internet or buy a book.” Meanwhile, public-private partnerships and the commercialization of research continue to receive generous government support. In 2012, the government announced the creation of a £100 million fund to boost university research through private sector involvement. Also in 2012, England opened its first for-profit university – the College of Law – which will charge £9,000 in annual fees (Paton 2012a).

2013). Professor Geoffrey Alderman of the University of Buckingham notes that students are “behaving like consumers and looking for what returns they will get for the investments they are making” (cited in Copping 2011). In response, universities have cut thousands of “soft degree courses” in programs associated with weaker employment prospects (Harris 2012; Loveys 2011).

While England offers an extreme example of how the costs of higher education are being downloaded to its “customers,” many public higher education systems are moving in the same direction. In nations where tuition fees have been in place for a long time – such as Canada, the US, Australia and the Netherlands – costs have increased considerably. According to one estimate, the cost of obtaining a degree in the US has increased by 1,120 percent over the past 35 years (Jamrisko and Kolet 2012). In other countries where higher education has traditionally been free or inexpensive, “non-tuition” fees have been introduced or increased. In Ireland, for example, no tuition fees are charged but the “student contribution” or registration fees – which increased by €500 in 2011 to €2,000 – are comparable to tuition costs in many countries (Marcucci and Usher 2012). Increasing tuition and other student fees is a key part of the corporatization agenda. Not coincidentally, countries with higher tuition levels also tend to be those where corporations and other private entities contribute the most to university funding (OECD 2012b).

Yet, these trends are not universal. There remains considerable cross-national variation in university fee structures. In Europe, public university students in Greece, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Iceland and Norway study virtually free of charge. Norway and Iceland stand alone among their Nordic neighbours

in not charging tuition fees to students regardless of citizenship. In Germany, only a few of the country's 16 federal states currently charge fees in public higher education. There are also distinct differences within the UK. While tuition has skyrocketed in England and Wales, fees remain more affordable in Ireland and free in Scotland. In fact, Scottish higher education has moved in the opposite direction by abolishing student fees and setting ambitious targets to widen access for disadvantaged groups (Denholm 2012a; 2012b). Many countries in Latin America, such as Brazil and Venezuela, have also maintained free public higher education. With regard to Mexico, several years ago there was an attempt by the government to raise tuition at the national university, the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM), which led to a national student strike that forced the government to reverse its position. It is interesting to compare the UNAM in Mexico with the University of California, which was hit with enormous budget cuts, tuition increases and student unrest in 2009. Noam Chomsky visited both university systems that year and his comments are worth quoting at length:

I had a startling experience a few weeks ago. I travelled to Mexico City for talks at the National University, an enormous and very impressive institution with high standards of achievement and scholarship. Entrance is selective, but the university is virtually free. I then visited an even more remarkable institution, the college in Mexico City ... It is not only free, but has open admissions ... Shortly after I went to San Francisco for talks, and learned more about the California institutions of higher education. They have been at the very peak of the international higher education system. By now tuitions are quite high, even for in-state students, and cutbacks are affecting teaching, research, and staff. Needless to say, Mexico is a poor country with a struggling economy, and California should be one of the richest places in the world, with incomparable advantages. I mention these recent experiences only to emphasize that the recent cut-backs in higher education seen in much of the world cannot simply be traced to economic problems. Rather, they reflect fundamental choices about the nature of the society in which we will live. If it is to be designed for the wealthy and privileged ... then these are good

choices. If we have different aspirations for the world of our children and grandchildren, the choices are shameful and ruinous.

Escalating education fees, whether in California, the UK, Canada or elsewhere, do not merely reflect an economic strategy or the inevitable impact of public funding cuts. Rather, as Chomsky suggests, downloading the costs of higher education to students and their families is a political choice that reflects particular assumptions about education and what constitutes a just society. In Canada, successive federal administrations and most provincial governments have adopted a “customers pay” orientation to university financing that has resulted in Canada having some of the highest tuition fees in the world. The next section provides an overview of Canadian tuition trends in the era of corporatization.

Tuition Trends in Canada: An Overview

Average tuition fees in Canada fell in constant dollars through the 1970s. Although fees began to rise in the 1980s, by 1986-87 they had still only reached 88 percent of their 1974-75 level (Cameron 1991). It was in the 1990s and 2000s when tuition fees climbed dramatically. As shown in Table 6.1, the cost of undergraduate tuition grew from an average of \$1,706 in 1991-92 to \$5,366 in 2011-12, an increase of 215 percent (CAUT 2012a). These trends can also be illustrated by looking at changes in university operating revenues. Between 1979 and 2009, the proportion of operating revenues provided by governments declined from 84 to 58 percent. At same time, the proportion funded by tuition fees increased from 12 to 35 percent (CAUT 2012a). In 2009, government funding as a share of university operating revenues ranged from 75 percent in Newfoundland and 70 percent in Quebec, to just 50 percent in Ontario and 48 percent in Nova Scotia.

Tuition increases in Canada have been most prominent in the case of professional programs. Between 1990 and 2003, medical fees, adjusted for inflation, rose by 320 percent. At the same time, law school tuition rose by 217 percent and dental school tuition increased by 400 percent (CAUT 2003). By 2012-13, undergraduate students in dentistry were paying the highest average annual fees in the country (\$16,910), followed

Table 6.1
Average Undergraduate Tuition

Year	Province										
	NL	PEI	NS	NB	QC	ON	MB	SK	AB	BC	CA
1991-92 (\$)	1,544	2,141	2,232	2,046	1,311	1,818	1,848	1,859	1,544	1,970	1,706
2011-12 (\$)	2,649	5,258	5,731	5,853	2,519	6,640	3,645	5,601	5,662	4,852	5,366
% Increase	71.6	145.6	156.8	186.1	92.1	265.2	97.2	201.3	266.7	146.3	214.5

Source: *Canadian Association of University Teachers Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2012-2013*.

by medicine (\$11, 891) and pharmacy (\$10, 297) (Statistics Canada 2012). A list of the ten most expensive undergraduate programs in Canada, half of which are in dentistry, is provided in Table 6.2. At the graduate level, the most expensive program continues to be the Executive Master of Business Administration (MBA) – with average fees of \$38,508

– followed by regular MBA programs at \$23,757.¹⁴⁶

Of course, escalating costs have not impacted all Canadians equally. Between 1980 and 2007, for example, undergraduate tuition as a proportion of average net income grew from eight to 18 percent for those in the lowest income quintile. For those in the highest income group, it grew from just two to three percent (Motte, Berger and Parkin

Table 6.2
Most Expensive Undergraduate University Programs in Canada

University	Faculty	Tuition Fees
University of Saskatchewan	Dentistry	\$32,960
University of Toronto	Dentistry	\$26,960
University of Western Ontario	Dentistry	\$25,683
University of British Columbia	Dentistry	\$25,046
University of Toronto	Law	\$24,467
University of Toronto	Pharmacy	\$23,764
McMaster University	Medicine	\$21,679
University of Western Ontario	Business, Mgmt & Public Admin	\$21,499
University of Alberta	Dentistry	\$19,699
University of Ottawa	Medicine	\$19,567

Source: *Canadian Association of University Teachers Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2012-2013*.

¹⁴⁶ McGill University is one institution where fees for MBA students have significantly increased in recent years. In a move supported by 45 of Quebec's leading CEOs, in 2011 McGill began charging \$29,500 a year for its two year MBA program, an increase of nearly 900 percent. In response, the provincial government fined the university \$2 million (Montpetit 2011; Pagliaro 2010).

2009). In 1990 in Ontario, a middle-income family could earn the equivalent of four years of tuition in 87 days; by 2012, the average time required had increased to 195 days (CCPA 2013a). According to BMO Financial Group, two thirds of Canadian parents say that they cannot afford the costs of sending their children to university (Singleton 2010). TD Canada Trust's 2011 education and finances survey tells a similar story. It showed that 93 percent of Canadians report that saving for their children's education was a top financial priority, but only 33 percent said they had any chance of saving enough money to pay for more than 10 percent of these costs (CBC News 2011).

It is also important to note that higher tuition fees have not been compensated for by an increase in educational quality. On the contrary, students have encountered diminished library holdings, deteriorating lab equipment, a reduction in course offerings and larger class sizes. In fact, large classes are now the norm in most Canadian universities, especially in the largest institutions. According to the AUCC (2007a), in the late 1970s there were 12 full-time students for every full-time faculty member. By 2003, this ratio had climbed to 20:1. The most dramatic increases in student-faculty ratios have occurred in Ontario, where they rose from 16:1 in 1987 to 27:1 in 2007 (OCUFA 2010c). While some organizations, like the Council of Ontario Universities (2011a), view “reduced teaching costs through larger class sizes” as enhancing educational efficiency, most are more critical. In a recent Ontario faculty survey, 62 percent of respondents said they were facing larger classes than just a few years ago, and this was cited as the most pressing

example of declining educational quality (OCUFA 2009b; see also OCUFA 2012b).¹⁴⁷

Large classes are problematic for a number of reasons, including that they reduce the possibilities for student-faculty interaction and classroom engagement, both of which (as noted in Chapter 4) are important for student learning.

The Importance of Provincial Variation

The decentralized nature of Canadian post-secondary education means that attending to provincial variation, as well as shifting government policies within each province, is critical when evaluating certain education trends. Several examples are used here to illustrate the importance of provincial variation in explaining tuition trends and the complexities of corporatization in Canada. As shown in Table 6.1, tuition rose by 146 percent in British Columbia between 1991-92 and 2011-12. However, this overall increase was highly uneven over the two decades. For instance, between 1996-97 and 2001-02 tuition declined as the New Democratic Party (NDP) implemented a tuition freeze (Malcolmson and Lee 2004). As a result, BC students paid the second lowest tuition in Canada at the beginning of the 2000s. When the freeze was lifted by the incoming Liberal government, tuition increased over the next several years, bringing tuition levels closer to the national average. In Manitoba, tuition rose sharply in the 1990s under successive Conservative governments. In the early 2000s, however, the NDP government froze tuition, implemented a 10 percent tuition rollback, and then resumed the freeze at the third lowest level in the country after Newfoundland and Quebec. In

¹⁴⁷ In 2009, the Task Force on Competitiveness, Productivity and Economic Progress reviewed the results of the National Survey on Student Engagement. It concluded that Ontario's student to faculty ratio was nearly 40 percent worse than public universities in the US. The Task Force also stated that, relative to world's 200 leading universities, "Ontario universities score terribly on the staff per student component" (p. 45).

Saskatchewan, the government froze tuition between 2005 and 2008, but these policies followed three decades of successive tuition growth. Between 1990-91 and 2004-05, tuition climbed by an average of 8.5 percent a year under NDP leadership, almost four times the average annual rate of inflation (Gingrich 2011).

It is also instructive to contrast Ontario with Quebec. In 2003, the election of Liberal governments in both provinces brought different outcomes in the area of student financing and accessibility. In Quebec, the government implemented policies to deregulate tuition and reduce financial assistance, whereas in Ontario the Liberals increased tuition regulation. Of course, the different policies of the two governments need to be understood in the context of the nature and impact of previous policy environments. Despite Quebec moving to increase the amount of tuition paid by students in 2003, the province still had the lowest fees in Canada, and the Parti Québécois' focus on the principle of universal access helps to explain the province's distinctive status in this area. In contrast, the actions of the Liberal government in Ontario followed the "common sense revolution" of Premier Mike Harris' Conservative government. In the area of higher education, the Conservative's policy agenda included sharp reductions in public funding and the deregulation of tuition fees that saw tuition levels in Ontario rise to among the highest in the country (for a good discussion, see Fisher et al. 2009).

Today, there are dramatic differences between Ontario and Quebec. As illustrated in Table 6.1, tuition grew faster in Ontario over the past two decades (265 percent) than in any other Canadian province. At \$6,640 a year, Ontario now has the highest tuition fees

in Canada.¹⁴⁸ Over the same period, fees in Quebec increased by just 92 percent and its undergraduate tuition of \$2,519 remains the lowest in the country. Although the province's Liberal government had promised significant tuition increases beginning in 2012-13, massive student protests and the victory of the Parti Québécois in the 2012 provincial election ensured that the proposed increases were repealed. The unique history of student militancy in Quebec – which has included a total of nine student strikes since 1968 – is one reason why students have consistently paid lower tuition than students in other provinces.¹⁴⁹ It should be noted, however, that Quebec universities charge much higher fees for out of province students, a practice that does not exist elsewhere in the country.

While Quebec's tuition remains the lowest in Canada, it is closely followed by Newfoundland. In the late 1990s, per capita student debt in Newfoundland was the highest in the country (Dunne and Falvo 2011). In 1999, the province's Liberal government implemented a tuition freeze in response to student unrest. Two years later, the government rolled back tuition by 25 percent. When the Conservatives took power in 2003, they maintained the tuition freeze and added additional measures to increase affordability, such as reducing interest rates on student loans and implementing a non-repayable needs-based grant system for all post-secondary students. In 2013, the government continued these policies by providing \$25.8 million to help reduce student

¹⁴⁸ In 1989, tuition fees cost Ontario families in the lowest income quintile 17 percent of their net income. By 2004, the cost for this same group was 46 percent of their income. It has been projected that by 2027, the overall cost of an undergraduate degree in Ontario could rise to more than \$137,000, a considerable increase over the \$77,000 cost in 2010 (OCUFA 2010c).

¹⁴⁹ The 2012 student protest movements were all the more impressive given the slanted media coverage of the tuition issue in Quebec. For example, a content analysis of 143 editorials and columns about tuition fees published over a five year period (2005-2010) revealed that 125 of these texts firmly supported a large fee increase, while only four unequivocally opposed it (Tremblay-Pepin 2013).

debt, which included \$3.8 million to Memorial University to maintain its tuition freeze for 2013-14 (CAUT 2013a). These policies are in stark contrast to those of other Atlantic provinces, which have allowed tuition to steadily increase.

Table 6.3
Tuition and Compulsory Fees, 1990-91 to 2015-16 (Current \$)

Year (\$)	Province										
	NL	PEI	NS	NB	QC	ON	MB	SK	AB	BC	CA
1990-91	1,422	2,120	2,147	2,016	1,115	2,105	1,676	1,591	1,551	1,982	1,744
2011-12	2,861	5,764	6,443	6,283	3,278	7,513	4,065	6,192	7,061	5,511	6,186
2015-16	2,893	6,743	7,252	7,107	3,664	9,231	4,400	6,990	8,827	6,133	7,330

Source: Macdonald, David and Erica Shaker. 2012. "Eduflation and the High Cost of Learning."

Another way that Canadian universities are increasing the costs borne by their consumers is by charging higher "user-fees" (e.g., fees for health, dental and athletic services). Additional compulsory fees rose by 134 percent across Canada between 1993-94 and 2008-09, with documented increases in every province (Gingrich 2009; Shaker 2006). According to Statistics Canada (2012), additional compulsory fees for undergraduate students in 2012-13 were lowest in Newfoundland and highest in Alberta. This is in addition to the rising cost of textbooks, which continue to increase at two to three times the rate of inflation (Gingrich 2009). In their research, David Macdonald and Erika Shaker (2012) combine compulsory fees with tuition fees to offer a more complete

picture of higher education costs. Their data shows that when these additional fees are included, Newfoundland is actually the least expensive province, followed by Quebec (see Table 6.3). At the other end of spectrum, Ontario and Alberta are the most expensive. Macdonald and Shaker also construct a “Cost of Learning” index that takes tuition and compulsory fees in each province and adjusts for any increased earnings for families with children. According to the index, in 2011-12 Newfoundland’s cost of learning was the most affordable for a median-income family, while Nova Scotia’s was the least affordable. For low-income families, Newfoundland was again the most affordable province while Ontario was the least.¹⁵⁰ Finally, the researchers consider current policy trends to estimate the overall cost of university education for the 2015-16 academic year. Table 6.3 shows that fees are expected to increase the most in Ontario, Alberta and Prince Edward Island, and the least in Newfoundland, Quebec and Manitoba.

These variations in tuition and user fees across Canada mean that one cannot evaluate tuition trends without attending to provincial variation. Changes in the timing and mix of public and private revenue streams across provinces illustrates that the process of corporatization is not a linear one; certain provinces have embraced neoliberal restructuring at different times, and to different degrees, than others.

International Student Recruitment and Fees

In addition to studying the consequences of corporatization for domestic students, it is also important to look at how these changes have impacted international students studying in Canada. The number of international students studying at Canadian universities has increased every year since the mid-1990s. By 2010, approximately 8

¹⁵⁰ It should be noted that when Ontario’s new 30 percent tuition rebate is included in the calculation, Alberta becomes the least affordable.

percent of undergraduates and 20 percent of the graduate student population were international students (AUCC 2010c). Between 2010 and 2011 alone, full-time international university enrolment increased by 11 percent and the number of international university students reached 100,000, which is a four-fold increase since 1995.

International student mobility has positive elements. For instance, it can be a source of cultural enrichment and foster cross-national research collaboration. According to the AUCC's 2006 internationalization survey, "academic" rationales for international student recruitment are common within the university community. In fact, 92 percent of respondents stated that their institutions recruited international students to promote a more globally diverse campus (AUCC 2007b). I would argue, however, that it is critical to understand the amount of money that is generated through international students. Universities around the world have expanded recruitment activities for international students with the explicit goal of maximizing revenue. These students are seen as a lucrative investment because they typically pay extraordinarily high fees. In Canada, international students were not charged differential tuition prior to the late 1970s. Yet, in recent years, tuition fees for international students have increased sharply (+86 percent over the 2000s). By 2012-13, average tuition for international undergraduate students in Canada was \$18,641 – more than three times the average rate paid by Canadian citizens (Statistics Canada 2012). This figure rises to over \$25,000 for many graduate programs and \$57,000 for some professional programs. It should also be noted that international students are often excluded from policies designed to protect Canadian-born residents, such as tuition freezes. Not surprisingly, a recent survey by the Canadian Bureau for

International Education found that cost was one of the biggest obstacles for students wishing to study in Canada. The survey also found that 40 percent of international students in Canada reported having difficulties paying their tuition (Senate of Canada 2011). High tuition for international students may also be affecting enrolment trends.¹⁵¹

Under corporatization, international student recruitment has been saturated by the language of the market. This shift is evident in government policy discourse. In Quebec, for example, international students have been re-categorized as “international goods and services” (Shaker 2006). At the federal level, a report commissioned by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) concluded that the education of international students is a major Canadian “export industry” (Rosyln Kunin and Associates 2009). A more recent version of the report notes that international students increased government revenues by \$445 million and contributed 7.7 billion to the Canadian economy in 2010 (Rosyln Kunin and Associates 2012). Likewise, international student recruitment is now virtually synonymous with marketing and branding. The first phase of Canada’s new international education strategy began in 2007, when DFAIT selected Bang Marketing, a Montreal-based company, to develop a distinct education-Canada brand (see Birchard 2007; Tamburri 2008). A year later, DFAIT’s multi-million dollar “Imagine Education au/in Canada” brand was officially launched to sell Canadian education abroad. More recently, the federal government has recommended a new 15-point marketing strategy to draw international students away from more prestigious universities in the US and UK (Ipsos Reid 2012). And, as part of the 2013 federal budget,

¹⁵¹ Between 1992 and 2008, the share of international students enrolled in “business, management and public administration” increased from 14 to 23 percent, which was the largest gain across disciplines (McMullen and Elias 2011).

the government announced an investment of \$23 million over two years to promote Canada as an international study destination.¹⁵² University presidents have also launched a series of their own recruitment ventures, including when a delegation of 15 presidents visited India in 2010, with the goals of improving the “Canada brand” and convincing “the hosts that they were not in their country simply to try and boost Canada’s international student enrolment numbers” (Fine 2010b).

Tuition Increases: The Views of Proponents and Critics

As the above sections make clear, regardless of whether one is a domestic or international student, there have been significant increases in tuition costs across Canada. Proponents and critics of corporatization hold radically different views about this trend. Proponents argue that increasing the proportion of university funding paid for by individuals is in the best interests of students and the public. Because they see the benefits of higher education as accruing primarily to individuals, they contend that education should be viewed as a private rather than a public good, and that students (redefined as consumers in this context) should pay most of the costs. From this perspective, shifting the costs from taxpayers to students results in greater equity between those who pay and those who benefit. They also argue that this arrangement improves the educational “product” because students, as consumers, are less tolerant of substandard learning environments and poor teaching and, like other consumers, demand greater efficiencies. The focus on efficiency, in turn, decreases the real cost of education and means that student and employer expectations govern higher education to a greater extent.

¹⁵² For more information on the role of international student recruitment in Canada’s global economic strategy, see the Advisory Panel on Canada’s International Education Strategy (2012).

These kinds of arguments are often bound up with purported concerns for social justice. For many advocates of tuition deregulation, low or regulated tuition means that middle and upper class individuals, who account for a disproportionate share of university attendees, are accessing higher education at a fraction of the cost of what they can actually afford to pay. Not only that, but low income taxpayers, who presumably receive fewer benefits from higher education, are required to finance the education of more financially privileged groups. Following this line of argument, low tuition policies and, by extension, increased public investments in higher education discriminate against the poor because they represent a net transfer of wealth from lower to higher income families. Some proponents go one step further to argue that consistently high enrolment rates prove that increased tuition does not render university education inaccessible for low-income families. For this group, to the extent that tuition does lead to financial hardship, expanded access to student loans and grants is sufficient to mitigate the problem (e.g., Pakravan 2006).

In response, I would contend that university students are *not* subsidized by taxpayers; rather, publicly funded university education is a profitable investment for the public treasury. The social rate of return to public education spending significantly exceeds the cost of this spending, even if governments have to run deficits. Quantified in economic terms, the direct public benefit of investing in higher education has been estimated at \$100,000 per individual, or a 160 percent return on each dollar invested (CFS 2012). According to Igliska Ivanova (2012), university graduates in British Columbia pay much more than the full cost of their education through their increased tax contributions and reduced reliance on government transfers. Compared to individuals

with a high school education, Ivanova found that men with an undergraduate degree contribute, on average, \$159,000 more to the public treasury over their working lives, while women contribute \$106,000 more. In contrast, a four-year undergraduate degree costs approximately \$50,000 (of which tuition fees make up 40 percent). Further, because the affluent pay more taxes, financing higher education through general government revenues amounts to a transfer of income from higher to lower income families, not the other way around. As tuition increases, the progressive elements of the post-secondary finance structure are reduced (Mackenzie 2005).

While corporatization's supporters emphasize the individual benefits of higher education –including both market related benefits (e.g., improved labour marketability and higher wages)¹⁵³ and non-market related benefits (e.g., greater personal health, happiness, longevity and quality of life) – it is equally important to consider the social benefits of higher education. For instance, the creation of new knowledge often benefits current and future generations, especially if this knowledge is widely disseminated and not subject to exclusionary mechanisms. Other social benefits include reductions in poverty and inequality, environmental sustainability, higher levels of civic participation and increased community cohesion. Indeed, government involvement in the financing and provision of higher education is based on the premise that it accrues social benefits. While the study of non-market social benefits from education is still in its infancy,

¹⁵³ Interestingly, whether and how much a university education improves earnings has been the subject of debate. The Canadian Council on Learning (2010a) reports that those who hold a Bachelor's degree earn nearly \$750,000 more than a high school graduate over a 40-year period. This figure fits with the common assertion that a university degree holder earns, on average, \$1 million more over his or her lifetime because of educational credentials. However, other analysts argue that this earnings premium has been exaggerated. According to the Canadian Federation of Students (2007a), when inflation is factored into the equation, the additional potential earnings of a university education is closer to \$150,000. Relying on more recent data, the Federation asserts that this earnings differential may be even lower than it previously claimed, sitting at just \$80,000 for men and \$46,000 for women (CFS 2012).

evidence suggests that these benefits have been underestimated (Klein 2006; McMahon 2009; Riddell 2005). The social benefits of public funding were also evident during the recent global economic crisis. As discussed in Chapter 5, while many private US universities experienced severe financial hardship resulting from investment losses, Canada's public system was largely protected because of the relatively small proportion of university revenues drawn from investments. From this perspective, not only has there been considerable *underinvestment* in higher education, but government funding cuts coupled with increased tuition are highly inefficient from both an economic and social perspective.

Furthermore, as Macdonald and Shaker (2011) point out, relatively small changes in the tax system could dramatically reduce tuition levels. For example, the total cost of rolling back undergraduate tuition rates in Ontario to their 1990 level – or from \$6,500 to \$2,500 a year – would cost \$1.5 billion (adjusted for inflation and the growing student population). In contrast, the corporate tax cuts the province introduced in 2009 were estimated at \$1.6 billion. They also note that tuition in Ontario could be eliminated if Ontario families paid an average of \$170 more per year in taxes. Since 2000, Canadian federal governments have also chosen to forgo \$48 billion in revenues through tax cuts, with much of it going into the pockets of corporations. Just 10 percent of that money could have been used to eliminate tuition fees for all students currently enrolled in Canadian universities (Falvo 2012).

What Does the Public Think?

Compared with most governments and university administrators, the Canadian public is remarkably progressive in its views on university tuition and funding. Survey results

indicate that the public strongly disagrees with a “customers pay” model of university financing. One 2009 poll found that 86 percent of Canadians believe tuition fees should be frozen or reduced (51 percent said reduced), while only 9 percent said they should be raised, and over half of the respondents stated that university and college tuition should eventually be eliminated altogether (CAUT 2009b). More recent polls have found that a majority of Canadians rank reductions in tuition and student debt as the top priority for government investments in education (CAUT 2011c; CFS 2012). These results are not surprising, given the increasing concern about student debt reported through national polls and the fact that 93 percent of Canadians agree that cost should not prevent qualified students from attending university (e.g., CAUT 2011c, CCL 2009a). National surveys have also found that a majority of Canadians, in all regions of the country, believe that governments should invest more in universities and colleges, even if it means they would personally have to pay more in taxes (CAUT 2011c; CFS 2011, 2012).

These national results are supported by a number of provincial surveys. According to a poll in Nova Scotia, for instance, 83 percent of respondents stated that tuition should be reduced (CFS 2011). In Ontario, a large majority of the population – close to 80 percent – opposes increasing tuition as a measure to reduce university costs. Furthermore, one third of Ontarians identify lowering or capping tuition as the “single most important thing” the provincial government should do for university education in the province (OCUFA 2013). Just as the public opposes rising tuition fees, it also supports generous public funding for higher education. For instance, approximately 80 percent of Ontario residents believe that governments rather than students should pay a larger share of the costs of post-secondary education (Ekos 2005, 2003). And a survey by the Ontario

Confederation of University Faculty Associations (2013) found that cutting public funding for universities received the lowest support rating amongst a list of 12 stimulus and cost-cutting strategies designed to help manage Ontario's financial situation.

Student Debt and Student Aid: Recent Trends

Not surprisingly, increases in tuition fees and changes to national and provincial policies have had a significant impact on student debt. In 2012, student debt in the United States surpassed \$1 trillion. While Canadian students fare somewhat better than their American counterparts, student debt has emerged as a significant and growing problem in Canada. During the 1990s, debt among Canadian undergraduates doubled and it has continued to rise since (CCL 2010a). Today, federal government student loan debt in Canada is approximately \$15 billion; when provincial and commercial bank loans are included, the total is closer to \$20 billion (Macdonald and Shaker 2012). According to Statistics Canada, between 1982 and 1995 the average student loan amount for Bachelor's degree graduates rose by 121 percent for men and 145 percent for women. From 1995 to 2005, the proportion of student loan borrowers that owed \$25,000 or more at graduation increased from 17 to 27 percent, while the proportion owing more than \$50,000 tripled (Luong 2010). Sixty percent of Canadian students currently graduate with average debts of over \$27,000 for an undergraduate degree. Based on an average salary of approximately \$40,000, it takes students an average of 14 years to pay off this level of debt (Mangaroo 2012). This \$27,000 figure does not include private debt accumulated by students, not does it include parental support.¹⁵⁴ As costs escalate, students have also

¹⁵⁴ More borrowing by students and parents has also contributed to, and risks increasing, the alarmingly high level of household debt in Canada, which by late 2012 had climbed to 163 percent of family income (Dunn 2012).

been forced to diversify their sources of funding. According to data from the Canadian University Survey Consortium, between 2002 and 2011 the proportion of undergraduates who relied on four or more funding sources nearly doubled, from 21 to 39 percent (Prairie Research Associates 2002, 2011). Moreover, the average amount from each funding source increased from \$9,000 to nearly \$12,000.

Of course, tuition increases are not the only source of rising student debt. A series of changes in student aid policies have also played a role. In general, beginning in the 1990s, there was a shift in federal financing policies from universal to targeted programs and from funding institutions to funding individuals. Consistent with this ethos, the federal government has initiated specific initiatives in response to increases in student debt load, including (i) altering the definition of “student loan” to exclude \$1.5 billion in student debt, and (ii) raising the legislated ceiling set by the Canada Student Financial Assistance Act of student loans owed to the government from \$15 to \$19 billion. Under corporatization, there has also been a shift in student aid from grants to loans. In some countries, student loans have been introduced where they did not exist before (e.g., France in 1991, Hungary in 2001). In others, like Canada, funding systems have tilted towards loans and away from grants and scholarship programs. Unlike grants, which subsidize the costs of higher education through the tax system, loans are a more private cost because they must be repaid by students.

Related to this, there has been an increasing reliance on tax expenditures as the preferred form of direct student assistance.¹⁵⁵ Tax credits are designed to offset tuition

¹⁵⁵ At the federal level, these measures have included the Education Tax Credit; Student Loan Interest Tax Credit; Tuition Fee Tax Credit; Textbook Tax Credit; Scholarship, Fellowship and Bursary Tax Credit; and the Registered Education Savings Plans.

costs and help families save money for post-secondary education. While some argue that these measures are beneficial (e.g., Usher and Duncan 2008), most of the evidence suggests that tax credits are a regressive and inefficient policy measure. For example, all students qualify for tax credits regardless of socioeconomic status and financial need, which disproportionately benefits those from higher income backgrounds. Moreover, tax credits have little impact on accessibility because most students are unable to claim these credits while in school, so the money is not available to meet tuition and living expenses. They are also associated with enormous costs. In 2009, the much maligned Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation¹⁵⁶ was replaced with the Canada Student Grants Program (CSGP). According to the CCPA's (2013b) *Alternative Federal Budget 2013*, "the CSGP will distribute roughly \$614 million this year, while the Canada Student Loan Program expects to lend \$2.3 billion. Although a substantial amount of funds are being distributed through the CSGP, it pales in comparison to the \$2.81 billion the government spends on education-related tax credits and savings schemes." (p. 118). So, if the money provided through tax credits was shifted to direct upfront grants distributed by the Canada Student Loan Program (CSLP), it would turn every dollar loaned by the CSLP into a non-repayable grant, which would dramatically reduce the need for students to borrow. As it stands, however, the aggregate of student loans disbursed by the CSLP (minus the aggregate of loan repayments received) is increasing at approximately \$1 million per day (CFS 2012).

¹⁵⁶ The Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation (CMSF) was created in 1998 by the Liberal government to administer an endowment of \$2.5 billion. The CMSF was charged with providing bursaries and scholarships to hundreds of thousands of Canadian students. The foundation also carried out a well-funded (though transparently partisan) higher education research program. An independent review of the Fund in 2003 found that incompetent administration and a lack of federal oversight allowed some provinces to divert CMSF money into provincial coffers, or use it to replace existing provincial aid programs. For a more detailed critique of the CMSF, see CFS (2007b).

In addition to there being differences in tuition policies by province, there are also differences in student aid policies and in student debt. For instance, while the average debt load for Canadian students enrolled in their final year of a bachelor's program is \$27,000, this figure is only \$15,000 for student in Quebec, the lowest in the country (Martin and Tremblay-Pepin 2011). This lower debt load is a product of lower tuition fees as well as the province's relatively generous financial aid programs. Likewise in Manitoba, tuition freezes and increases in non-repayable student aid has resulted in the province having the second lowest incidence of student borrowing and the second lowest level of per capita student debt. There have also been a number of interesting changes in Newfoundland. In the late 1990s, student debt in the province was the highest in the country, with over 20,000 students owing more than an average of \$30,000. Years of subsequent tuition relief and generous student aid policies has since led to a precipitous drop in the number of students relying on financial assistance and significant reductions in overall debt load (Dunne and Falvo 2011). From 2002-03 to 2008-09, the proportion of full-time university students receiving a Canada student loan in Newfoundland declined from 57 to 31 percent (CAUT 2011d). In contrast, since 2000, student debt in the other three Atlantic Provinces has increased faster than the national average, with student debt in Nova Scotia being the highest in the country (Berger 2009b).

Turning to Ontario, between 1990-91 and 2009-10 the number of full-time Canada student loan recipients in the province increased 142 percent. In fact, Ontario accounted for the vast majority of new student loan borrowers during this period, making it largely responsible for the national increase of 67 percent (CAUT 2012a). Despite the increasing number of borrowers, however, student debt in Ontario has been mitigated to some extent

by recent increases in grants and other non-repayable aid. In Saskatchewan, three decades of successive tuition growth meant that by 2006, 36 percent of university graduates reported debt loads of more than \$20,000 (Gingrich 2009). While the tuition freeze that followed did provide some debt relief for students and the number of borrowers declined, university graduates reporting debts of more than \$20,000 continued to increase (CAUT 2011d; Gingrich 2011). In British Columbia, student debt in the 2000s also mirrored larger trends. Rising fees and the elimination of the province's needs-based grant program in 2004 meant that undergraduate debt grew faster in BC than in any other province over the course of the decade (Berger 2009b).

As this cursory review suggests, Canadian provinces have very different student debt profiles. Not only do provinces differ in the amount of upfront aid they offer students, they also have different repayment and after-the-fact debt relief policies. In 2009, Newfoundland became the first province to eliminate interest on the provincial portion of student loans. It also implemented a debt forgiveness policy for the provincial share of student debt. Likewise, Prince Edward Island now has a zero interest policy on provincial loans. In sharp contrast, interest rates on student loans in BC are the highest in the country and interest begins accumulating immediately after studies are complete (other provinces have a six-month grace period). Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick all have a "debt cap" that limits the degree to which students can go into debt; Manitoba has a bursary program designed to limit debt; Saskatchewan provides financial incentives for graduates who choose to remain and work in the province. Although Alberta cancelled its Student Loan Relief program in 2012, it replaced it with small grants for students who complete their programs or find work in particular occupations.

As Macdonald and Shaker (2012) note, most debt relief policies are applied retroactively. Student-consumers must still provide most of the money upfront, and tuition cannot be paid with tax credits. As I discuss in the subsequent sections, high tuition and debt rates across the country are associated with a range of social consequences, including that some students are excluded from participating in higher education altogether.

The Social Consequences of Rising Tuition and Student Debt

Concerns about tuition and debt have a major impact on the decisions and choices that students make. According to a 2006 national survey, nearly 40 percent of Canadian post-secondary students stated that debt concerns were a major factor underlying their personal life decisions, including their living and working arrangements (Ekos 2006). Of those students whose academic decisions were also impacted by debt, a significant proportion said it led them to choose schools with lower tuition, attend school part-time and take reduced course loads. Moreover, nearly one in five stated that it led them to attend college instead of university. Not surprisingly, these results varied by province. Students in Quebec, for example, were far less concerned about debt and it was less likely to impact their educational choices. It is questionable, however, whether decisions that are motivated by financial hardship should be viewed as matters of “choice.” For example, thirty percent of the students surveyed indicated that personal decisions made on the basis of cost/debt were entirely or mostly involuntary (roughly the same proportion said they were “somewhat” voluntary). The impact of cost and debt on student decision-making – and the resulting outcomes – can be broken down into three sets of “choices:” (i) those made by students before or upon entering (or not entering) university; (ii) those made by students during the course of their studies, and (iii) those

made by university graduates. The following sections will briefly review each of these in turn.

Tuition, Debt and Access

Financial considerations often influence where students choose to study. For example, the sharp rise in tuition in England has contributed to a recent increase in applications to universities in Ireland and Scotland (BBC News 2012; Marshall 2012). Similarly in Canada, tuition levels have impacted provincial enrolment trends, especially in Atlantic Canada. Between 1997 and 2009, the number of students from Nova Scotia attending Memorial University in Newfoundland increased by over 1000 percent, while the number of students from New Brunswick attending Memorial increased by 800 percent. By 2010, approximately one sixth of Memorial's 14,000 undergraduate students were from out of province (compared with just 137 out of province students in 1997). The primary reason given by these students for choosing Memorial is the university's low tuition fees (Macdonald and Shaker 2012).

Taking a step back from decisions about which university to attend, what about the more fundamental decision of whether to attend university in the first place? University "access" can be viewed in two ways. From a supply-side perspective – where a primary consideration is the supply of trained graduates – the key question is "how many." That is, the greater the level of participation or attendance, the greater the level of access. From a social welfare perspective, the more important question is "who attends" because it takes into account the characteristics of university attendees. From this perspective, an accessible education system is one in which everybody has an equal opportunity to participate. Unfortunately, much of the research on post-secondary attendance narrowly

equates participation with access. If university access is measured solely in terms of “how many” students attend, then access has increased steadily over the years, even in provinces with higher tuition fees (in economic terms, demand for higher education is sometimes said to be “inelastic,” or independent of the cost). These high enrolment rates are often used by proponents of increased tuition to refute the claim that escalating costs have made university education unaffordable.¹⁵⁷ The relationship between access and the socioeconomic characteristics of university attendees, however, is more complex. To begin with, post-secondary students in Canada have always been disproportionately drawn from higher income families (see Porter 1965). In 2006, youth between the ages of 18 and 24 with parents earning more than \$100,000 in pre-tax income were nearly twice as likely to attend university compared to those whose parents earned less than \$25,000 (CAUT 2012a). This disparity in participation rates by family income has been confirmed by de Broucker (2005) and Finnie, Childs and Wismer (2011). There are many explanations for this participation gap, but the fact that university attendance is stratified by social class is not in dispute. The question is whether poor and other disadvantaged groups have an equal opportunity to participate.

To answer this question, it is useful to begin by surveying public opinion polls. As noted above, an overwhelming majority of Canadians believe that cost should not prevent qualified individuals from attending institutions of higher learning (CAUT 2011c; Ipsos-Reid 2004). At the same time, polls also show that most Canadians believe cost *does* reduce access for low-income groups and these concerns have become more acute as fees

¹⁵⁷ Some even suggest there may be a positive association between tuition and access because greater tuition revenues allow universities to expand the number of places available for students (e.g., Milway 2005).

continue to rise (e.g., CCL 2009a; CFS 2009; Doherty-Delorme and Shaker 2004; Ekos 2005). Public opinion on this issue aligns with self-reported data from secondary school graduates, which shows that cost/finances are the most commonly cited barrier to post-secondary participation (e.g., Barr-Telford et al. 2003; CCL 2009b; Ipsos-Reid 2001; Market Quest Research Group 2005). Academic research also supports the claim that escalating costs have reduced access for low-income groups. In the US, research points to a steep decline in university/college access for low-income students and students of colour (e.g., Burd 2002; Porter 2006; Rosenstone 2005). While the Canadian literature is less conclusive,¹⁵⁸ many studies suggest that access to university has become more difficult for underprivileged families (e.g., Bouchard and Zhao 2000; Coelli 2005, 2009; Neill 2009), especially in the case of professional programs. According to the Canadian Federation of Students (2010), high tuition/high debt financing models have had an especially detrimental impact on racialized groups in Canada. Evidence also points to a shifting social class composition among students in particular universities (e.g., Davies and Quirke 2002) and provinces. For instance, John Conway's (2004) influential report on university accessibility in Saskatchewan demonstrates that increasing tuition and other financial barriers have been severe impediments for rural, low-income and Aboriginal students.

Proponents of tuition deregulation argue that needs-based programs of financial aid allow the vast majority (if not all) students to attend university if they choose. What they often fail to consider are the financial and other hardships resulting from excessive debt loads, as well as the deterrent effect of debt aversion (Wilson 2003). Debt aversion is the

¹⁵⁸ For overviews of this literature, see Coelli 2009, Mueller 2008, Tandem Social Research Consulting 2007 and Usher and Potter 2006.

personal calculation that debt accumulation and repayment are not worth the returns from higher education. It is one of the most common reasons given by students who never pursue post-secondary studies, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds who are more averse to borrowing and the possibility of default (CCL 2010a; R.A. Malatest and Associates 2007). According to the CFS (2009: 11), “students from racialised communities and lower income backgrounds, as well as single parents are more likely to hold negative feelings about taking on student debt. Two-thirds of students who decide against enrolling in university say that student debt affected their decision.”

Completion Time, Persistence and Employment

Financial concerns also impact students during the course of their studies. For example, concerns about cost/debt have been shown to affect completion times and completion rates. According to one Canadian survey, nearly half of those students who said they were completing their studies at a slower pace reported that finances were a major reason. An additional one in four said that finances were somewhat related to slower completion (Ekos 2006). Others studies indicate that as student debt rises, persistence declines. Writing in the *Harvard Education Review*, Dongbin Kim (2007) argues that increased borrowing has had an especially negative impact on degree completion for low-income students in the US because students from underprivileged backgrounds have less tolerance for educational debt – or greater debt aversion – which in turn affects their chances for completion. As a result, financing higher education through increased loans may actually be widening (not narrowing) the gap in educational opportunity and degree attainment by social class.

Similar outcomes have been reported in Canada. Lori McElroy (2005) found that the more money students borrow on an annual basis, the lower their level of persistence. Like Kim, McElroy suggests that debt aversion may underlie this negative association. According to the CAUT (2007), students who borrow more than \$10,000 are less than half as likely to complete a degree program (34 percent) as those who borrow less than \$1,000 (71 percent). Related research has shown that students who discontinue their studies often cite financial obstacles as an explanation (Diallo, Trottier and Doray 2009). That debt has an adverse effect on persistence is also affirmed by Joshua Mitchell, President of the Canadian Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, who told the Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology that “those who are most at risk with post-secondary participation, in particular students from low-income families, first generation students and Aboriginal students, will abandon post-secondary education if their loan debt is too high” (Senate of Canada 2011).

Obtaining paid employment is another decision that can impact if and when students complete their studies. The proportion of students who were employed while attending university has increased from roughly one quarter in 1976 to nearly one half in 2008 (CFS 2012). According to Statistics Canada (2009b), the proportion of 20-24 year-olds who were employed while in school increased in every province between 1997-98 and 2007-08. Not only are more students taking on paid employment, they are also working longer hours (Motte and Schwartz 2009).¹⁵⁹ Working at the same time as

¹⁵⁹ Although the global financial crisis led to a modest reduction in the number of students working during the school year, these rates remain far above those of previous decades (Statistics Canada 2010b). The more substantial impact of the crisis was the significant jump in the number of students who were unable to obtain summer employment beginning in 2009. This contributed to a greater reliance on financial aid and to increasing student debt.

attending university may have a positive impact in some instances. However, research suggests that students – especially those from poorer backgrounds and/or with higher levels of debt – are far more likely to report adverse rather than positive impacts (CFS 2012; Ekos 2006; OCUFA 2010c; Prairie Research Associates 2007a, 2010). And not surprisingly, the more students work, the more likely they are to report negative impacts. One study found that 40 percent of first year students who worked ten hours a week or less reported that it negatively impacted their studies, compared with 70 percent of those working over 30 hours a week (Prairie Research Associates 2007a). Adverse effects of paid employment include negative correlations with class preparation and attendance, study time, grades, as well as course and degree completion (Callender 2008; Côté and Allahar 2007; Motte and Schwartz 2009). As more and more young people are forced to complete their studies between periods of employment, they are arguably losing their identity as students as well. In other words, “student life” – a time of growing independence, “voluntary” poverty, leisure, exploration and free intellectual inquiry – is being redefined as a mode of contingent labour. Under corporatization, the categories of “student” and “worker” increasingly overlap, with students becoming workers who happen to study.

Post-Graduation: The Disciplinary Function of Debt

Students who borrow to finance their first post-secondary degree are significantly less likely than those who do not to pursue further study. Likewise, university graduates with high levels of debt are less likely to pursue a second degree than those with less debt (Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission 2007; Millet 2003; Prairie Research Associates 2007b; Williams 2012). The influence of financial considerations on pursuing

additional education is especially dramatic in the case of professional programs. Over the last 15 years, entry into these professions has become far more difficult for families at lower income levels. Research in Ontario, for example, shows a precipitous decline in participation rates among poorer students in professional programs such as law, dentistry and medicine (Conlon 2006; Frenette 2008; King, Warren and Miklas 2004; Kwong et al. 2002).

Financial concerns also impact career decisions. Upon graduation, many indebted students discover that their career choices are restricted to jobs that allow them to pay off their loans. For this reason, many find it difficult to consider public service or other less lucrative occupations. Once again, this tendency has been noted in the case of professional programs, such as law (Field 2009). According to Stuart Tannock (2006):

A recent survey found that two-thirds of law graduates say that debt is a primary factor in keeping them from considering a career in public interest law ... Other surveys have found that about half of the students who begin law school with stated public interest law commitments go into private practice law upon graduation, in large part because of their debt burden. For those students who do take a public-interest law job after law school, many find that they are unable to keep on working in this sector for more than two or three years, at which point they transfer into more lucrative positions (pp. 48-49).

It was these kinds of concerns (as well as concerns about access) that prompted a highly critical response on the part of the Canadian Bar Association (2003) to law school tuition increases.

Of course, the effects of debt are not limited to the legal profession. Robert Chernomas and Errol Black (2004) have considered the impact of debt on medical school graduates. They suggest that physician shortages can be explained, in part, by the fact that graduates are taking longer to begin their careers because they are specializing rather

than pursuing general practice. The authors also note that financial considerations are having an impact on speciality choice and practice location, which could exacerbate the divide in medical services between urban and rural communities.¹⁶⁰

Student debt not only influences career and personal life decisions¹⁶¹ – including the kinds of jobs and wages graduates seek – it also permeates everyday life in ways that impact the political culture. For instance, students in earlier generations were relatively free to devote themselves to social and political causes prior to entering the workforce. However, as more and more students are forced to confront the debt “time bombs” that await them after graduation, participating in social activism becomes less tenable. In other words, debt dependence serves a disciplining and individualizing function. It contributes to the creation of a fragmented society where individuals are focused on individual concerns and less likely to be engaged in collective activities. Not coincidentally, the possibilities for a social movement against growing tuition and student debt have been pre-empted, at least in part, by the political discipline that a customer pay model of higher education imposes on young people.

The next chapter explores the specific impacts of corporatization on another segment of the university population: administrators. Recast in the role of corporate

¹⁶⁰ The impact of student debt on career choices was addressed by Bill Clinton in his speech at the Democratic National Convention in 2012. Speaking to Barack Obama’s plan to alleviate debt through student loan reform, Clinton stated that “if someone wants to take a job with a modest income, a teacher, a police officer, if they want to be a small-town doctor in a little rural area, they won’t have to turn those jobs down because they don’t pay enough to repay the debt ... this will change the future for young Americans” (Clinton 2012).

¹⁶¹ Although the personal life choices of those with high debt are not addressed here, research has found that Canadians who hold student debt are less likely to have savings and investments and are less likely to own a home. Those that do own a home are more likely to have a mortgage (Luong 2010). High student debt also leads many graduates to “postpone marriage, to postpone having children, or, in general, to be unable to participate fully in adult life” (Schwartz 1999: 316). Jeffrey Williams (2012) likens growing student debt to a form of bondage, similar in principle and practice to “indentured servitude.”

managers, administrators have increased their political influence within the university by appropriating power from faculty and academic bodies. They have also adopted a more corporate management style, which means that faculty are increasingly treated as subordinate workers rather than autonomous professionals. In Chapter 7, I analyze these transformations in university governance in detail.

Chapter Seven: The Corporate Management Takeover of Higher Education

In the 1950s, Canada's academic community was ruled by a strict academic hierarchy where professors rarely contested managerial decisions. By the end of the decade, however, critical challenges to the prevailing mode of governance had begun to take shape (e.g., Fowke 1959; Rowat 1956; Smith 1960). In the 1960s, these challenges increased along with the rise of university-based social activism. Students and professors claimed that the management of universities was overly secretive and targeted the "corporate university," or "knowledge factory," where campus relations and governance practices were said to resemble those of a business establishment. In his writing during that time, Vernon Fowke (1959) argued that university boards of governors were inappropriately modeled on the structure of the business corporation. Similarly, Donald Rowat (1964) claimed that the top-down systems of managerial control found in corporations had no place in universities, and called on academics to free themselves from hierarchical structures and their "master-servant" relationship with administrators. These movements for governance reform were also supported by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) and a prominent national commission headed by James Duff and Robert Berdahl (1966) that called for more open and democratic systems of university management.

These combined pressures led most Canadian universities to review and revise their governance arrangements over the 1960s and 1970s. In concrete terms, this meant that academics expanded their representation in senate bodies and new systems of peer review were created to allow faculty greater input into hiring, tenure and promotion decisions.

Likewise, students won places on faculty councils, departmental committees and senates. University boards of governors also underwent significant change. According to David Cameron (1991), the proportion of university boards with faculty representation increased from 9 percent in 1955, to 32 percent in 1965, and to 92 percent in 1975. The growth in student participation was just as dramatic. In 1965, not one board of governors had a student representative. By 1975, more than three quarters of boards had students as members. While the impact of these changes should not be exaggerated, they did mean that collegial governance had become institutionalized.

The corporatization of higher education has challenged these modest but significant gains. Over the past 40 years, the management of Canadian universities has shifted to a more corporate model of organization and control. The first section of this chapter focuses on the growth of university administrations and the changing characteristics and commitments of administrators, with a particular emphasis on university presidents and boards of governors. The second section explores practices of “managerialism” within the university, focusing on the centralization of administrative power, the incorporation of performance indicators, ranking systems and marketing techniques into university management, as well as the suppression of academic freedom. The third and final section discusses the impact of corporate governance models and growing corporate-university ties on university curriculums, infrastructure and program development, and the future of liberal education.

Changing of the Guard: University Administrators in the Era of Corporatization

During the “golden age” of Canadian higher education, university administrators were largely drawn from the academic community and assumed a collegial leadership role. The primary responsibilities of the administration were to support teaching and research and protect the university’s autonomy from outside interests. The corporatization of the university has led to changes in the role of university administrations and in the makeup of individuals who occupy their leading positions. This shift is evidenced by a number of indicators as outlined below.

The Impact of Fiscal Retrenchment

A major impetus behind the transformation of university governance was fiscal retrenchment. In response to government cutbacks, faculty members in many provinces responded with calls for unionization and collective bargaining. The unionization process first took hold in Quebec, where over 60 percent of professors were unionized by 1975 (Newson and Buchbinder 1988). By the early 1980s, over half of the Canadian professoriate belonged to certified bargaining units. The movement for unionization and collective bargaining was an important development for university employees, and essentially helped to democratize the university. Benefits included providing faculty with some protection against budgetary cutbacks, improved salaries and working conditions, as well as preserving the active role of academics in university governance.¹⁶² At the same time, unionization inadvertently contributed to conditions that gave rise to the corporatization of the university by facilitating a more corporate administration

¹⁶² For a contrary view, see Cameron (2002).

apparatus, where the interests of administrators (management) were pitted against those of faculty (workers). It also served to legitimate the existence of the administration as a separate entity within the university, or as some have argued, to equate the administration with the university itself. According to James Cameron (1978), for faculty to negotiate with “the university” was to accept the administration as “denoting an employing authority, like Bell Canada or Imperial Oil” (p. 79).

Also in line with the corporate agenda, universities began to increasingly turn to private sources of financial support, which meant that administrators devoted a greater share of institutional resources to external relations, such as fundraising and the expansion of public-private partnerships. It was claimed that these new priorities required “better management” in the form of centralized executive leadership, in part because the business community favoured secretive deals between senior university administrators and corporate management. In other words, administrators needed to be freed from faculty influence and cumbersome democratic procedures to deal with growing financial concerns. As Stanley Aronowitz (2000: 165) explains it, university administrators assumed the “standpoint of the institution against those who would resist the ‘necessary’ and ‘rational’ decisions that any administrator must make in the face of relative scarcity – a perspective emblematic of even the most profitable corporations.” A consequence of these changes was the further differentiation of the managerial apparatus from the academic community. Stepping outside of their collegial leadership role, administrators began to be viewed – and to view themselves – as resource and personnel directors rather than academic representatives. Increasingly, “career administrators” were hired from outside of the academy and those within the university no longer returned to their

academic posts. As the austerity agenda deepened, administrative and academic functions became “specialized and structurally distinct” and administrations acquired a “place of their own” within the university (Newson and Buchbinder 1988: 16).

Expanding Ranks and Salaries

University administrations have expanded considerably under corporatization. In part, the rise in the number of administrative positions reflects an increased demand for administrative services and increased student support; however, evidence suggests that this growth has outpaced other dimensions of educational expansion (e.g., student enrolment and faculty hiring). While there is no reliable data on administrative growth at the national level, several provincial-level examples can be used to illustrate this shift. At the Université de Montreal, the relative weight of administrative personnel increased from 10 to 15 percent of total university staff between 2000 and 2008 (or from 817 to 1,712 employees). Over the same period, the proportion of professors fell from 26 to 22 percent (Martin and Tremblay-Pepin 2011). At the University of Saskatchewan, the number of full-time equivalent academic staff increased from 984 in 2003-04 to 1,119 in 2009-10, whereas the number of full-time equivalent positions for administrative, technical, clerical and other support staff increased from 2,993 to 3,986 (Gingrich 2011). At the University of Calgary, just one of the university’s six vice-presidents – the one in charge of fundraising – boasts an administrative team consisting of one senior director, four executive directors, 13 directors, four associate directors and 13 lesser officers and co-ordinators (Cooper 2012).

Another indicator of administrative expansion is that administrations are consuming a greater and greater share of institutional resources. According to data from Statistics

Canada and the Canadian Association of University Business Officers (CAUBO), 20 cents is now spent on central administration for every dollar spent on instruction and non-sponsored research, up from 12 cents in 1987-88 (Smith 2010). Also using CAUBO data, Polster (2011) found that between 1973 and 2008, the growth in “administration and general costs” outpaced the growth in faculty salaries by a wide margin.¹⁶³ Evidence suggests that the salaries of senior administrators in Canada have risen under corporatization. For example, even though faculty at the University of Manitoba remain among the lowest paid in Canada, senior administrators have enjoyed huge pay raises. Between 2003 and 2006 alone, the salaries of nine top administrators increased by 27 percent, or more than \$400,000 (Guard et al. 2007). Similarly, administrative salaries at the University of Saskatchewan increased from 8 to 14 percent of total university expenditures between 1990-91 and 2001-02, while academic salaries declined from 41 to 36 percent. At the University of Regina, total administrative pay constituted 75 percent of total faculty pay in 2000; by 2008, administrative salaries exceeded those of faculty (Gingrich 2009).

Similar trends are evident in other provinces. In their research, Azim Essaji and Sue Horton (2010) found that executive compensation in Ontario universities increased by 40 percent in real terms between 1996 and 2006, this at a time when Ontario universities were ostensibly under severe financial stress. Increases were found across all universities

¹⁶³ These trends are not confined to Canada. In the UK, the number of university managers increased more than three times as fast as the number of academics between 2003 and 2010 (Turner 2010), and the pay of top administrators at many universities has increased (Paton 2012b). In the US, between 1975 and 2005 the number of administrators and administrative staffers grew by an “astonishing” 85 and 240 percent respectively, while the number of full-time professors grew by just 51 percent (Ginsberg 2011: 25). According to Trevor Hussey and Patrick Smith (2010), as managerial bureaucracies become entrenched in universities, their first tendency is to proliferate. They liken this process to a “fungal attack” where, slowly but surely, “classrooms are converted into offices, academics become a decreasing proportion of the workforce and an increasing proportion of the available funds is spent on the non-academic sector” (p. 21).

and among all types of senior administrators, with the changes being especially dramatic at some institutions. According to the Association of Professors at the University of Ottawa, administrative expenditures rose by an average of 40 percent between 2003 and 2009. In contrast, overall university expenditures increased by an average of just four percent over the same period (CAUT 2010c). In Quebec, the percentage of payroll expenditures for university managers and administrators grew by 83 percent between 1997 and 2004 (Martin and Tremblay-Pepin 2011). Looking specifically at the Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM), between 2000 and 2006 payroll expenditures for professors increased by 19 percent, which was significantly less than the 30 percent increase for management staff and 40 percent increase for senior executives. The issue of executive compensation also played a role in the 2011 strike at Vancouver Island University (CAUT 2011e). It is worth noting that the public disagrees with these dominant restructuring trends. According to one national poll, 50 percent of Canadians said that the best strategy to compensate for funding shortfalls in higher education would be to reduce administration costs. In contrast, just nine percent advocated increasing tuition (CAUT 2011c).

It is difficult to avoid comparing executive compensation trends in the business world with administrators in the world of higher education. Just as escalating corporate salaries are justified by the “pressures” associated with downsizing, cost-cutting and labour market restructuring, university administrators are getting paid more to pursue a similar mandate.¹⁶⁴ The similarities between business managers and the new type of

¹⁶⁴ The rise in executive pay in universities does mirror trends in the business world, although not to the same degree. For example, the average compensation of Canada’s 100 highest paid CEOs in 2010 was \$8.38 million, a 27 percent increase over the \$6.6 million they pocketed in 2009 (Mackenzie 2012).

university executives are especially evident in the case of university presidents. As Randall Nelsen (2002: 133) has argued, the “leaders of universities and their partners representing other corporate businesses have evolved to a point where they are thought of, and think of themselves, as one and the same.”

The New University CEOs

The roles and expectations of a university president have traditionally been more complex than those of a corporate CEO. Before the onset of corporatization, university presidents were expected to act as a representative of the faculty *and* the administration, in addition to their responsibilities as a colleague, an advocate for students, a negotiator with governments, a public servant and a scholar.¹⁶⁵ It was also common for university presidents to play an esteemed role in social and political life through their capacity as public intellectuals. Henry Giroux (2002) offers numerous examples of former university presidents in the US – such as James Conant, Robert Hutchins and Clark Kerr – whose writings provoked national debates and helped to shape the intellectual culture. Similarly, in Canada, there are many cases of past presidents functioning as public intellectuals, most noticeably in their writings on higher education. Examples include Claude Bissell (*The Strength of the University* 1968), James Corry (*Farewell the Ivory Tower* 1970) and Murray Ross (*New Universities in the Modern World* 1966). While a president’s role remains varied and complex, I would argue that the process of corporatization has simplified it considerably by aligning its roles and responsibilities more closely with those of top business executives.

¹⁶⁵ Writing in the early twentieth century, journalist Upton Sinclair described a president’s job as placing the individual “not merely in the line of the warring forces of the class struggle, but between the incompatible elements of human nature itself – between greed and service, between hate and love, between body and spirit” (cited in Donoghue 2008: 16).

Unlike years past, few university presidents today assume positions of intellectual leadership or rise to the status of public intellectuals. The reluctance of today's presidents to speak out on matters of social and political concern reflects changes in university recruitment strategies as well as presidential job requirements. In *Leadership Under Fire*, Ross Paul (2011), former president of the University of Windsor, states that university administrations in Canada are increasingly seeking presidents with "corporate leadership styles more akin to those of a chief executive officer than to those of the more traditional academic leader of previous generations" (p. 54). Private fundraising, in particular, has become a "critical component of presidential success, sometimes misconstrued by search committees as a singular talent unrelated to the more traditional skills of academic leadership and good management" (p. 182). Paul gives the example of Robert Prichard, former president of the University of Toronto (U of T), whose legendary fundraising abilities helped to build an endowment of more than a billion dollars.¹⁶⁶ According to Doug Owram (2010), few presidents today spend less than a quarter of their time (and most spend more) on the fundraising trail. This division of labour is in sharp contrast to just a few decades ago, when presidential fundraising in Canada was a marginal activity. These requirements also make it more difficult for presidents to speak out on public issues, as taking a moral stand on controversial subjects risks alienating private donors and sponsors.

¹⁶⁶ It is also interesting to note that the university's emphasis on private fundraising meant that John Dellandrea, former director of fundraising at the U of T, had a larger salary than president Prichard. In 1995, their salaries were \$250,660 and \$199,500 respectively (Tudiver 1999). Generating additional income has become so important to the corporate university that some Ontario universities are now using public money to hire private lobbyists (Duff 2010). A total of nine institutions were found to have spent approximately \$1 million on private lobbying, with York accounting for approximately half that total. These lobbyists were hired primarily for their "revolving-door" government-business connections.

Given their changing roles and characteristics, it is not surprising that university presidents tend to support a corporatization agenda. In the 1980s, Buchbinder and Newson (1990: 370) noted a “surprising degree of unanimity” among presidents with respect to their views on corporate-university linkages (and in their willingness to use their institutional positions to discredit alternative agendas).¹⁶⁷ More recent research suggests that increased corporate involvement with universities – particularly university research – is viewed as positive by most university presidents. In fact, presidents tend to argue that corporatization does not have a detrimental impact on arts-related disciplines, university research agendas or intellectual and institutional autonomy (Mount and Bélanger 2001). There is also a high degree of support among presidents (and other administrators) for increased tuition fees (Ross 2011; Woodhouse 2009).¹⁶⁸ Although there is little Canadian research on the attitudes of university presidents in the areas of hiring and tenure, US research suggests that most university leaders favour a contract system of employment.¹⁶⁹

Of course, university presidents differ in the extent to which they support the corporatization of the university. While some may offer only tacit support, others are more proactive. For example, the above-mentioned Prichard was a zealous supporter of

¹⁶⁷ As early as 1985, University of Regina president Lloyd Barber argued that: “If you sat around the table and listened to the discussion and didn’t know, you’d be hard-pressed to know who was a university president and who was a corporate president” (cited in Nelsen 2002: 133).

¹⁶⁸ For example, Robert Campbell, President of Mount Allison University, argues that tuition in Canada should be fully deregulated and that Canadians need to overcome their “tuition phobia” (cited in Anderson 2012). Other administrative pleas for tuition flexibility can be found in recent publications by the University of Toronto (e.g., 2008a, 2008b).

¹⁶⁹ In the US, less than one quarter of higher education leaders surveyed said they would prefer that full-time, tenured professors make up a majority of faculty at their institutions, and seventy percent expressed support for limited contracts (Stripling 2011). Also of note is that those presidents who had previously held faculty positions were much more likely those who had not to support tenure, which highlights the implications of the growing recruitment of administrators from outside of the academy.

what he called a “market-driven, deregulated, competitive and differentiated” university system (cited in Woodhouse 2009: 230). For Prichard, key features of this system included the “production of better services to customers” and bringing a greater variety of products to market. Market discipline was a source of freedom in Prichard’s view because it allowed administrators to raise tuition and aggressively court private donors. The former president’s pro-corporatization stance is also reflected in his lobbying efforts. Prichard aggressively petitioned the federal government in support of the drug company Apotex – one of the U of T’s most prominent donors – earning him the undistinguished title of “drug lobbyist” (Washburn 2005: 124). A more recent example of a pro-corporatization president is Mamdouh Shoukri, now in his second term as president of York University. Shoukri’s mandate has been heavily focused on research commercialization in science, engineering and medicine. Before his tenure at York, Shoukri pursued corporate-university partnerships at McMaster, where he served as Research Vice President. His previous experience in the private sector (Hydro Ottawa) may help to explain his institutional stance. Research has shown that Canadian presidents who are actively involved in inter-corporate networks, such as service on corporate boards of directors, are more likely to support a corporatization agenda (e.g., Budros 2002).¹⁷⁰

As noted above, the salaries of university administrators have increased in recent years, and this trend is especially evident in the case of university CEOs. In the US, in

¹⁷⁰ Another possible addition to this list is Suzanne Fortier, former president of the National Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), who became president of McGill in 2013. During her time as head of NSERC, the organization underwent a controversial shift away from basic research and toward commercial research and corporate-university partnerships (Seidman 2013a). Although some maintain that Fortier was simply fulfilling the Conservative Government’s mandate, others insist that she shares much of the responsibility and is likely to bring the same kind of corporatized research agenda to McGill.

just one year, 81 university presidents earned more than \$500,000 and 12 earned over \$1 million (Ginsberg 2011). Like in the US, presidential compensation in Canada continues to rise. In many cases, presidential salaries are now more than double the level that would

Table 7.1
University Presidents' Compensation, 2010

University	President	2010 Salary	2010 Benefits	2010 Total
University of British Columbia	Stephen Toope	\$378,000	\$201,332	\$579,332
University of Alberta	Indira Samarasekera	\$502,000	-	\$502,000
York University	Mamdouh Shoukri	\$480,030	\$18,066	\$498,096
Simon Fraser University	Andrew Petter	\$303,956	\$175,877	\$479,833
University of Calgary	Elizabeth Cannon	\$449,000	\$24,000	\$473,000
Athabasca University	Frits Pannekoek	\$362,000	\$110,000	\$472,000
University of Western Ontario	Amit Chakma	\$440,000	\$29,742	\$469,743
University of Guelph	Alastair Summerlee	\$440,590	\$23,651	\$464,241
Memorial University	Gary Kachanoski	\$430,000	\$30,000	\$460,000
University of Victoria	David Turpin	\$303,246	\$156,507	\$459,753
Dalhousie University	Thomas Traves	\$385,635	\$62,733	\$448,368
University of Lethbridge	Michael Mahon	\$337,000	\$100,000	\$437,000
University of Toronto	David Naylor	\$380,100	\$51,409	\$431,509
University of Manitoba	David Barnard	-	-	\$426,212
University of Saskatchewan	Peter MacKinnon	-	-	\$425,000

Source: Canadian Association of University Teachers Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada, 2012-2013.

have been considered generous in the 1990s.¹⁷¹ The 2010 compensation figures for the 15 highest paid university presidents in Canada are provided in Table 7.1. As the table shows, Stephen Toope of the University of British Columbia and Indira Samarasekera of the University of Alberta top the list, with compensation packages of \$579,332 and \$502,000 respectively. Like university presidents, the profile and characteristics of university governing boards have also shifted under corporatization. The next section looks specifically at some of the changes to the makeup of university boards of governors in Canada.

Boards of Governors and University-Corporate Board Interlocks

The vast majority of Canadian universities operate under a bicameral structure of governance that includes a division of labour and responsibility between the senate and board of governors. Under corporatization, the role of senates has declined, while the role of boards has increased. Senates are generally controlled by elected faculty members (with significant student representation) and are formally responsible for all key academic decisions in the university. These decisions include setting educational policy goals, awarding scholarships, overseeing student evaluations and exams, and approving new courses, programs and admission standards. The senate is also a venue where the academic concerns of the entire university community can be discussed in a public forum. University boards of governors manage institutional resources and attend to the university's relationship with governments and other external stakeholders. Their

¹⁷¹ In part, this is because board compensation committees increasingly view the salaries of top executives as a reflection of institutional status and a logical corollary of new job requirements. This vision is exemplified by Colum Bastable, Chairman of McMaster's board of governors in 2008, who defended executive pay increases by noting that university presidents "should be compared with chief executive officers because of the growing demands to run universities like businesses" (Calgary Herald 2008).

principle statutory obligation is to ensure a university's financial well-being, and this control over budgetary processes often means that they have a considerable degree of control over academic priorities. Boards of governors are composed of university representatives and representatives from the community. When provisions are made for community members to join these boards, business leaders often represent "the community."

Membership on governing boards is in part honorific, but the appointment of business executives to university boards can benefit corporations in a number of ways. For one, these ties "project" corporate power into the educational sphere. Through corporate-university board interlocks, business leaders gain input into university research agendas and the training of skilled graduates. Not only can these ties serve the particular interests of corporations and corporate elites, they also help to strengthen the broader, hegemonic power of capital by (i) providing an avenue for cultural leadership and influence over the direction of educational reform, and (ii) facilitating the creation of a community of mutual interests across the university-industry divide and within the business community itself. For Canada's economic elite, university boards provide an additional forum for communication and decision-making and a venue to work out their common concerns. In this way, university boards provide a similar function to the boards of policy organizations, think-tanks and philanthropic foundations (Brownlee 2005; Carroll 2004; Clement 1975).

The presence of Canadian business leaders on university boards is not new. In *The Vertical Mosaic* (1965), John Porter observed that 80 individuals identified as members of the Canadian economic elite in 1951 held positions on the governing boards of 15

major Canadian universities. Porter added that the boards of certain prominent institutions, such as McGill and the U of T, “positively glitter with stars from the corporate world” (p. 301). Some years later, Michael Ornstein (1988) found that the average number of corporate-university interlocks via university boards doubled from 12.4 in 1946-50 to 24.9 in 1961-65. According to Ornstein, these interlocks declined in subsequent years in line with reforms noted at the beginning of the chapter. Nevertheless, corporate executives were still amply represented on boards during and after the “golden age.” Wallace Clement (1975), for example, found that 240 members of Canada’s economic elite in 1972 held a governing position in one of Canada’s private schools, universities or other institutions of higher learning.¹⁷² Another study of eight Ontario universities in 1974 found that 41 percent of board memberships were held by economic elites (Barkans and Pupo 1974, 1978).

As corporatization accelerated, the corporate “withdrawal” from university governing boards ended. In his work, William Carroll (2004) found that the presence of economic elites on boards of governors remained relatively stable from 1976 and 1996. However, other changes in the network meant that universities became more integrated into the world of corporate capital. For example, Carroll found evidence of increasing ties “*emanating from inside universities*, as major university presidents become members of the corporate elite” (p. 197, emphasis in original). According to Carroll, these ties suggest a “*deepening of corporate-university relations*, as chief executive officers of universities and corporations rub shoulders in corporate boardrooms and participate in a common

¹⁷² Like Porter, Clement notes the unique position of elite institutions such as the U of T. The university had 13 members of the economic elite on its 21-member board in 1972, eight of which held directorship positions in multiple corporations.

managerial culture.” Carroll also argues that the network of corporate-university ties became more “inclusive” during this period. Growing inclusivity or integration is evidenced by several markers, including: (i) the expansion of the network to include most major universities in Canada; (ii) the increasing number of “organic intellectuals” participating in the network (individuals who link corporations and universities through their participation in the governance of both institutions); and (iii) a strengthening of ties between major corporations and emergent “third party” organizations, such as the National Council on Education, the Corporate-Higher Education Forum and the Canadian Foundation for Innovation. Research demonstrates, in particular, how these third party organizations have contributed to the formation of a neoliberal consensus in the area of higher education.¹⁷³

Another way to document changes in the corporate-university network is by looking at the corporate backgrounds of university board members. Carroll’s (2004) work shows a significant increase in board representation among capital investment and (Canadian-based) high technology firms. Executives in investment companies, for example, may be considered good candidates for university governance as “beleaguered public institutions turn to private funding sources” (186). Likewise, the greater representation of executives from high technology companies could emerge from the synergetic relationship between these firms and the university’s role in providing high-technology products and services for the global economy. Others have documented a more insidious trend where “expert consultants in privatization” are being recruited to university boards (Tudiver 1999: 194).

¹⁷³ This neoliberal consensus has also been shaped by prominent Canadian think-tanks, such as the Fraser and CD Howe Institutes. For an analysis of ties between conservative think-tanks and Canadian universities, see Gutstein (2008).

This practice gained prominence in the 1990s as executives from companies such as Price Waterhouse, KPMG and Ernst & Young (all of which specialize in the privatization of public services) joined the governing boards of several Canadian universities, such as Queen's, Toronto, Regina, McGill and Concordia.¹⁷⁴ In fact, Dalhousie's Chancellor from 1994 to 2001, Sir Graham Day, was knighted by Margaret Thatcher for his work in privatizing British industry (CCPA 2005). In sum, although business leaders may not necessarily be joining university boards in significantly greater numbers, the network of corporate-university interlocks became deeper and more inclusive in the 1980s and 1990s.

There have been no detailed analyses of Canadian university-corporate board interlocks in the 2000s, but some research has documented the backgrounds and corporate affiliations of board members at particular universities (e.g., Arsenault 2007; CCPA 2005) as well as the ties between universities and particular industries (e.g., Cohen 2008). Also, the CAUT has been keeping track of corporate involvement on university boards through its *Directory of University and College / Corporate Board Linkages*. The most recent version of the Directory is from 2007-08. Overall the database identifies hundreds of public university board members that held corporate directorship positions in 2007-08. Of this group, 35 university board members held between three and four corporate positions simultaneously, while ten members held five positions and another

¹⁷⁴ Similar to how university boards are recruiting privatization consultants, Canadian academics are being recruited by privatization lobbyists. For instance, the Donner Canadian Foundations – Canada's most influential "free-enterprise" foundation – has provided millions of dollars in grant money for academic studies that investigate and promote privatization and the contracting out of public services (Brownlee 2005; Gutstein 2008).

ten held six or more.¹⁷⁵ The composition and social/economic backgrounds of university board members are key considerations when analyzing the relationship between universities and corporate power. In addition to strengthening the influence of corporations in the educational sphere, these ties can generate conflicts of interest. In 1969, Paul Axelrod (1982b) found that York University had millions of dollars invested in companies such as the Toronto Dominion Bank, Simpson's, General Motors and Ford. Not coincidentally, the membership of the board at that time included "the president of the Toronto Dominion Bank, the vice-president of Simpson's, the vice-president of General Motors, and a former director of the Ford Motor Co." (p. 211). Although direct conflicts of interest are not investigated here, evidence from the US suggests that conflicts of interest involving university administrations and corporations have become far more pervasive and widespread (Ginsberg 2011). At the very least, corporate representation on university boards (and vice versa) generate conflicts of commitment. Corporate executives have a fiduciary duty to advance the interests of their shareholders, and these interests often conflict with what is best for universities. Similarly, university officials

¹⁷⁵ This latter group of heavily interlocked directors included Peter Harder at the University of Ottawa, who held corporate positions at ARISE Technologies, Canada Life Assurance, Canada Life Financial, Great-West Life Assurance, Great-West Lifeco, IGM Financial, Kria Resources, London Life Insurance, Pinetree Capital and Power Financial Corporation; David O'Brian, who as chancellor of Concordia also held directorships at EnCana, Enerplus Resources Fund, Molson Coors Brewing, Royal Bank of Canada, TransCanada, TransCanada PipeLines and Vale Inco; and David Peterson, chancellor at the University of Toronto, who sat on the boards of BNP Paribas (Canada), Franco-Nevada, Industrial-Alliance Life Insurance, Ivanhoe Cambridge, Rogers Communications, VersaPay and Shoppers Drug Mart. As well, John Manley, current head of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, sat on Waterloo's board while serving at CAE, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, Canadian Pacific Railway, DG Acquisition Group, IPSA International and Optosecurity. It should also be noted that seven university presidents held corporate directorships in 2007-08. They included Indira Samarasekera at Alberta (Bank of Nova Scotia); Stephen Toope at UBC (ENMAX); Carleton's Roseann Runte (National Bank of Canada); Thomas Traves at Dalhousie (Clearwater, InNOVAcorp); Heather Munroe-Blum at McGill (Four Seasons Hotels); David Johnston at Waterloo (ARISE Technologies, Masco, CGI Group, Fairfax Financial); and the University of Winnipeg's Lloyd Axworthy (HudBay Minerals).

serving on corporate boards may find that their values, ideological dispositions and even their educational priorities are affected by their corporate obligations.¹⁷⁶ Also of note is that some governments are actively trying to increase the ties between the corporate sphere and administrators. The government of Quebec, for example, is currently in the process of changing the composition of university boards to give majority power to “independent” board members, thereby opening the door to greater corporate involvement.

The changes in the makeup of university administrations discussed so far have been complimented by the growth of university governance models that are more corporate and bureaucratic in nature, as administrators adopt “the values, management styles, cost-cutting procedures, and the language of ‘excellence’ that has been the hallmark of corporate culture” (Giroux and Giroux 2004: 225). The next section looks at the growth of these models in greater detail.

Corporate Governance Models

For proponents of market-based restructuring in higher education, corporatization is viewed in positive terms because it makes university governance more efficient. This argument rests on the assumption that the public sphere is inherently inefficient – burdened by bureaucracy, waste, convoluted decision-making and a culture of

¹⁷⁶ These conflicts may be unavoidable because the defining goals and principles of universities and corporations are inherently contradictory. As Thorstein Veblen argued, business training “unfits” individuals for scholarly pursuits and “even more pronouncedly for the surveillance of such pursuits” (see Veblen 2004: 50). Likewise, he said, the “sole effective function” of business-oriented university boards was to “interfere with the academic management in matters that are not of the nature of business, and that lie outside their competence and outside the range of their habitual interest” (pp. 45-46).

incompetence – whereas the private sector is well-managed, cost-conscious and accountable. It follows that reorganizing institutional governance in the image of the corporation is seen as a sensible choice, as it shifts governance from being guided by public policy to being grounded in business principles. More specifically, corporate management styles are seen as necessary to introduce more efficient budgetary processes and accounting controls as well as improved incentives for optimizing faculty productivity. These perspectives are grounded in a new organizing philosophy in the governance of public institutions known as “managerialism.”

According to Rosemary Deem (2008), the roots of the new managerialism can be traced to cuts in public expenditures and the introduction of quasi-markets in public services that began as part of the more general shift to neoliberalism. The ideology of managerialism holds that public institutions, including universities, should emulate efficient organizational models in the private sector. These include close monitoring of employee and institutional performance, the pursuit of key financial targets, benchmarks and “best practices,” and the widespread use of accountability measures (Shanahan 2009). Another assumption underlying managerialism is that management is of greater importance than the activities of those being managed. In this vein, the success of the public university depends on the effectiveness of its managerial apparatus rather than the quality of its teaching and research (Deem and Brehony 2005). Within the university context, managerialism can be analyzed as both a discourse and a set of administrative practices.

The Discourse of Managerialism

Managerialism is associated with a new discourse that informs and defines higher education. Eric Gould (2003: 86) characterizes this discourse as “corporate-styled eduspeak.” On the one hand, this language is often abstract. According to Rod Beecham (2008), it is no accident that terms like “excellence,” “accountability” and “quality” – synonyms for “good” in the corporate university – have become crude simplifications void of specific content. For Beecham, this language is used, in part, to substitute the clichés of managerialism for rational discourse on higher education. On the other hand, it would be a mistake to assume that the language of corporate eduspeak is devoid of meaning or impact because this language is often associated with managerial and market criteria. For example, the term “excellence” signifies how well a university is performing in its delivery of knowledge and skilled labour to the corporate economy. It is also used to denote high rankings on a number of quantifiable indicators, such as the dollar value of incoming grants, the level of research commercialization and the number of publications in prestigious academic journals. In this way, managerialist discourse is highly political and provides an important cover of legitimacy for the corporatizing university.¹⁷⁷ In contrast, academic notions of excellence and quality – which have traditionally emphasized things like well-maintained infrastructure, well-equipped libraries, adequate support staff and student services, low faculty-student ratios, open and democratic governance procedures, and broad public accessibility to the products of university research – are steadily losing ground. Of course, managerialism entails more than a

¹⁷⁷ For Bill Readings (1996), the notion of excellence in higher education “functions to allow the University to understand itself solely in terms of the structure of corporate administration ... the University of Excellence serves nothing other than itself, another corporation in a world of transnationally exchanged capital” (p. 29, 43).

change in language; it also embodies a new set of management practices that enforce and overlap with corporate governance models in the university. In the following sections, I outline several of the practices associated with corporate governance in Canadian universities.

Centralizing Power in the Academy

Like the strong faculty and student cultures of the 1960s and 1970s, today it is managerial cultures that have become more consistent and cohesive. Campus administrations increasingly view themselves as a culture apart from – or against – the values and norms of collegial governance. This is part of a move toward what Benjamin Ginsberg (2011) calls the “all-administrative university,” or a university where the faculty has no significant governance role.

In recent years, university administrations have assumed greater command over institutional objectives and policies. On some campuses, a stronger administrative presence has resulted in enhanced “security” measures (e.g., more cameras, police and student monitoring) and centralized control over resource allocation and messaging (e.g., room bookings, campus advertising). More importantly, there has been a significant shift in the relative power of administrations in relation to the professoriate. Recast in the role of professional managers, administrators have appropriated power from faculty and academic bodies. This appropriation takes many forms. At some institutions, administrators have replaced collegial processes with “consultation” exercises that limit faculty participation in governance (Polster 2011). At others, educational issues have been redefined as purely administrative, and therefore not subject to collegial input. A corporate management style also means that faculty members are increasingly treated as

subordinate workers rather than autonomous professionals. The consequences of this change for academics include intensified workloads, closer monitoring, performance evaluations, a loss of academic freedom and less access to institutional decision-making. As Gary Rhoades (1998) has argued, corporate management models turn faculty into “managed professionals.” Typically, Rhoades says, these models do not dismantle faculty governance structures; rather, they supersede them.

In a national survey of senate members and secretaries in Canada, Glen Jones, Theresa Shanahan and Paul Goyan (2004) found large discrepancies between what respondents believed senates *should* do and what they accomplished in practice. For instance, while 89 percent of respondents indicated that senates should play a role in determining the future direction of the university, only 43 percent agreed that they did. Moreover, 93 percent stated that senates should ask “tough questions” of senior university administrators, but less than half felt that senates held administrators accountable in this way. Overall, only 44 percent of respondents agreed that senates were effective as decision-making bodies, while 60 percent said they primarily approved decisions made elsewhere.¹⁷⁸ One of the most common reasons given for declining senate influence involved the challenges of making decisions within the context of fiscal austerity. As one respondent put it, “under circumstances of financial exigency and constraint the necessary priority given to monetary matters diminishes severely the effectiveness of the senate, without any reduction of the formally stated powers of that body. The focus of interest and attention shifts from academic concerns to financial ones” (p. 51). In other words, decisions about enrolments, admission standards, curriculums,

¹⁷⁸ A 2012 follow up study designed to replicate this study found that the responses to these questions were remarkably similar (see Pennock et al. 2012).

performance reviews, hiring policies and research priorities – all important academic matters – are increasingly defined in terms of financial or budgetary criteria. This is critical because financial decisions are generally under the purview of senior administrators, not university senates.

Performance Indicators

The shift toward greater market accountability in university management can be seen in the linking of budget allocations to performance indicators (PIs). While PIs have long been used by universities as a means of evaluating different aspects of academic quality, their purpose has changed in the context of corporatization. In their present context, PIs open up routine evaluations of academic activities to non-academic considerations.

Judgments of teaching quality and pedagogical formats, previously made within collegial forums, are being replaced by standardized “facts” such as class size, completion times and “costs per student.” PIs used for teaching can be compared across departments, faculties and even other universities to assess the cost-effectiveness of a given institution’s use of teaching resources. PIs in Canadian universities are also being used to monitor and support corporate priorities such as research commercialization (e.g., how many patents a department has registered), the training of graduates with relevant skills (e.g., how many “employable” graduates a university produces) and the generation of public-private partnerships (e.g., how many matching grants a department has obtained). According to William Bruneau (2000: 165), the federal government’s requirement that universities acquire matching funds from the private sector amounts to a “perfect” performance indicator in that “[t]hose universities most able to find matching funds in private industry will do better than those who cannot or will not. The result is ‘automatic’

expenditure of public funds for post-secondary education based on ‘performance’ in the private sector.”

All provincial governments collect performance data for universities; however, Alberta and Ontario are the two provinces where PIs most closely reflect the corporatization agenda. Alberta’s experiment with PIs began in the 1990s. Many of the indicators devised by Ralph Klein’s Conservative government were borrowed directly from the private sector and designed to serve private sector needs. For instance, not only did the government track student employment outcomes, it also generated “data on *employers’ satisfaction* with the education and skill level of recent graduates” (OCUFA 2006: 9, emphasis added). Alberta’s research PIs were also heavily market-based. These included: (i) the level of external grants, contracts and other sponsored research income, with an emphasis on industry funding; (ii) research output as measured by the quantity of publications and their citation rates, and (iii) the level of technology transfer as measured by licensing revenues and invention disclosures (Bruneau and Savage 2002; Conlon 2004; Gauthier 2004). According to William Bruneau and Donald Savage (2002: 198), by the early 2000s the effects of the Albertan PI regime were “numerous and depressing,” and included the disappearance of entire university departments and large staff reductions.

In Ontario, the introduction of PIs in the 1990s began as a mechanism to help student-consumers make “market-relevant” choices among programs and institutions (Lang 2005). However, their purpose soon shifted to provide a basis for allocating a portion of annual operating funding and influencing institutional behaviour, especially after the election of the Harris Conservative government that introduced Key

Performance Indicators (KPIs) for all colleges and universities. These KPIs included graduation rates by program as well as graduate employment and student loan default rates. Many analysts have pointed to the irrationally-narrow and punitive nature of these indicators and the fact that they ignored issues of educational quality. Critics also noted that these measures were not within the control of universities; rather, they were largely a function of prevailing economic conditions. According to Axelrod (2002: 98), the KPI system coerced universities into “making academic decisions (including curricular development) on the basis of expected market conditions – betting, as it were, on the programs most likely to meet immediate economic demand.” Recent Liberal governments in Ontario have maintained the same accountability mandate by allocating millions of dollars to “quality improvement” schemes, which in practice has meant accountability to the corporate interests that fund the Liberal party.¹⁷⁹

In practice, PIs have little to do with quality or accountability; they have been put in place largely to subvert the mission of universities toward private ends. As a managerial tool, PIs make it possible to decide on and control the internal activities of universities from outside of the settings in which academic work takes place. In this way, PIs shift the control over academic work upward and outward, toward administrators, governments and the private sector. These indicators are being used to institutionalize a complex system of administrative control over teaching and research in line with a corporatization agenda, and to support the notion that academics must be held accountable by external

¹⁷⁹ Universities in other provinces have been similarly affected. For example, Quebec’s system of “Performance Contracts” introduced in the early 2000s tied future increases in university revenues to “faculty productivity” as well as the implementation of corporate management practices. These contracts were intended to “impose uniformity on a diverse post-secondary system, to compel a new responsiveness (‘réceptivité’) to markets, and to force administrations across the system to adopt industrial techniques reminiscent of F.W. Taylor” (Bruneau and Savage 2002: 210).

pressures because they cannot be trusted to make informed judgements or perform quality work. Although the PI movement in Canada may not be as strong as it once was, many governments and universities continue to embrace them as a managerial tool.¹⁸⁰

University Rankings

Accompanying the use of performance indicators, ranking systems have become an increasingly popular method with which to assess universities around the world. In Canada, the most prominent ranking system is the annual *Maclean's* ranking of universities. Proponents claim that university rankings perform several beneficial functions in that they (i) respond to consumer demands for easily interpretable information about higher education; (ii) help to differentiate among institutions, programs and disciplines; (iii) stimulate competition among institutions, which enhances institutional quality; and (iv) function as a mechanism of accountability and quality control. Despite these supposed benefits, many, including the OECD, have questioned the use of university rankings on both methodological and moral grounds (Sharma 2010). In the area of methodology, rankings have been criticized for the validity of their indicators, which are often chosen on the basis of convenience or what *can* be measured, rather than what is relevant and important. For example, global ranking systems like the *Times Higher Education Supplement World Rankings* and Shanghai Jiao Tong University's *Academic Ranking of World Universities* rely heavily (sometimes exclusively) on research indicators, with the clear implication that institutional quality derives from

¹⁸⁰ There is some indication that the use of PIs in higher education is declining. Over the past decade, several nations that had enthusiastically embraced PIs (e.g., the US, New Zealand) are now acknowledging their limitations. Furthermore, resistance to PIs is growing. In 2010, for example, Sweden's University Chancellor, Anders Foldström, resigned in protest over the government's new PI system (Myklebust 2010). In Canada, the Federation of New Brunswick Faculty Associations recently released a sharp critique of the government's most recent PI scheme (Hans 2012).

research and research alone. Critics have also pointed to the arbitrary weighing of indicators in many ranking systems and their lack of reliability (Harvey 2008). In Canada, the *Maclean's* rankings have come under attack for their lack of methodological rigour; critics have repeatedly exposed *Maclean's* indicators and component indices for being internally inconsistent and unreliable, and for exaggerating variation and masking similarities between institutions (e.g., Page 2012; Page, Cramer and Page 2010).

The growing use of rankings is having a detrimental impact on higher education, students and the public at large. Jennifer Washburn (2005: 181), for one, claims that ranking systems are fueling a “competitive frenzy” in US higher education and locking universities into a positional “arms race,” where they are constantly scrambling to improve their rankings and prestige. She notes that any small change to an institution’s rankings can have enormous financial and academic repercussions. For this reason, ranking systems are “encouraging schools to use a variety of gimmicks and accounting tricks to manipulate their statistical data in ways that may be contrary to the public interest.” Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) have also noted these manipulative practices, such as making SAT scores “optional” for applicants (and thereby omitting the scores of less qualified and economically vulnerable students) and falsifying acceptance and yield rates. Student-selectivity indicators in some ranking systems can also threaten access for disadvantaged students by creating incentives for schools to recruit only those students who will be “assets” in terms of improving their ranked positions.¹⁸¹ Canada has not been immune to these kinds of administrative tactics. Several years ago it was revealed that

¹⁸¹ Conversely, some US schools have been rejecting highly qualified applicants whom admission officers believed were actually planning to attend college elsewhere in order to raise their “selectivity” scores, or the ratio of students accepted to the proportion of accepted students who enroll.

administrators at the University of British Columbia were pressuring faculty to manipulate course enrolments and cap class sizes in order to boost their *Maclean's* rankings. Internal documents showed that the administration advocated “lying to students about room capacity even if it meant denying students the opportunity to major in a discipline or graduate on time” (Doherty-Delorme and Shaker 2004: 20).

In the era of corporatization, the primary purpose (and effect) of higher education rankings is not to improve universities but to move them further into the embrace of the market. The approach of university rankings is very similar to that of publications like *Consumer Reports*. Rankings rely on and encourage the belief that “markets – the job market, corporate markets, the student-satisfaction market, the family-demand market – should fundamentally determine the curriculum, the teaching, the research, and the services of colleges and universities” (Bruneau and Savage 2002: 219). University rankings have also begun to shape public policy. A new report by the European University Association found that global ranking systems influence the development of immigration policies in some countries, affect the way that foreign qualifications are recognized and play a role in determining the choice of university partner institutions (Rauhvargers 2013). According to Karen MacGregor (2013), this past year “Brazil was sending 100,000 students to study abroad only at ranked institutions, [and] Russia was giving special recognition to degrees from top ranked universities.” Although these systems are unlikely to disappear in the short-term, it is important to note that many Canadian universities no longer supply information to *Maclean's*. Some senior administrators have even spoken out publicly. David Naylor (2006), president at the U of

T, candidly stated that his university “found *Maclean’s* useful for one thing only: marketing.”¹⁸²

Marketing the Corporate University

Aside from a modest amount of recruitment advertising, marketing activities have been outside the purview of university administrators for much of the twentieth century. Some even considered these practices to be an anathema. During his tenure as president of the U of T, Claude Bissell (1968: 174) warned of the dangerous implications that advertising had for education and society, noting that relying “upon over-simplification and exaggeration leads to the substitution of mass instinct for thought; the aim of the advertiser is, after all, to fix attention and not to engage the mind.” Nearly half a century later, advertising and marketing have become permanent fixtures in the activities of most university administrations. These practices are helping to transform higher education from a site of educational activity to one of material consumption. The increase in university marketing activities has been well documented. In the US, David Kirp (2003) has shown how the marketing campaigns of universities have become far more sophisticated and overt, and have contributed to the decline of the university’s public service mission. The same is true in the UK, where 70 universities increased their spending on marketing to students by 22 percent in the lead-up to the introduction of large tuition increases (Matthews 2013). In Canada too, there has been a considerable increase in the resources devoted to marketing by universities. Branding and other image-

¹⁸² Although Naylor has been critical of *Maclean’s*, he remains concerned about the relatively weak position of Canadian universities in global ranking systems. This weakness, he claims, is a product of Canada’s “highly egalitarian approach” to university funding and the refusal on the part of governments to strategically focus the country’s resources on a select number of top research institutions (Naylor 2013).

enhancing activities are designed to attract corporate sponsors and, just as importantly, to attract student-consumers.

In her research, Polster (2011: 149) found evidence of “expensive and escalating public relations wars” between public universities in Canada. These competitive engagements have led to a significant growth in the share of institutional resources devoted to advertising and promotional campaigns, as well as the expansion of non-academic services and facilities. These enhanced amenities are often paid for by tuition fees or by redirecting public money away from academic programs. Like private fundraising, marketing and branding also require an expansive administrative apparatus (e.g., public relations specialists). Furthermore, as rivalries among universities have become more intense, the scope, reach and consumer orientation of student recruitment activities have followed suit. For example, it is now common for universities in one city or province to market themselves – in newspapers, magazines and on the internet – to “target markets” in other jurisdictions. At the same time, universities have developed innovative program offerings, promotional strategies and student guarantees. According to Ken Steele (2010), Canadian universities

are conducting online contests for prizes ranging from iPads to SmartCars to tuition discounts. Many institutions guarantee residence accommodation for first-year undergraduates; some, such as Lakehead University, guarantee scholarships at particular grade averages, while the University of Calgary guarantees completion of a four-year degree within four years. The University of Regina now guarantees employment within six months of graduation. Although these ‘guarantees’ actually require significant commitment and effort from the student, the overall impression is increasingly one of education as a product for sale, satisfaction guaranteed.

Although the corporate reorientation of student recruitment may appear to empower student-consumers, the risk of deception and exploitation inherent in promotional (as

opposed to informational) advertising is cause for concern. Eleanor Abaya (2008), former director of communications at Lakehead University, explains that a university's brand is the "sum total of what it represents in reality as well as what its audiences perceive the organization to be."

Academic scholarship is also helping to define and strengthen university marketing activities. Research in the *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* demonstrates just how far a student-consumer discourse has been embraced in some segments of academia. For example, one group of articles moves beyond "rational" student motives for choosing a university, such as educational quality, to assess the impact of market imaging, "brand personalities" and impression management (Angulo, Pergelova and Rialp 2010; Opoku, Hultman and Saheli-Sangair 2008; Ramasubramanian, Gyure and Mursi 2003). Other work is devoted to measuring and enhancing student "brand loyalty." Topics explored here include the impact of institutional size on "relevant and desired marketing outcomes" (McAlexander and Koenig 2010: 69); how student trust in educational providers is translated into consumer allegiance (Carvalho and Mota 2010); and the linkages between brand perceptions and students' "conative, affective, and cognitive responses" (Bennett and Ali-Choudhury 2009: 85). Clearly, there is little difference between this literature and marketing literature in the business world.

The increasing orientation of universities in line with market concerns and their preoccupation with brand image means that institutional criticism on the part of faculty and students, as well as public displays of dissent or resistance on campuses, are increasingly viewed as a threat to the university's brand name. As a result, academic

freedom has become yet another casualty of administrative efforts to market the corporate university.

The Suppression of Academic Freedom

Concerns about market reputation and corporate funding have been associated with a number of changes in university governance, including a growing intolerance of “controversial” research and institutional criticism. This intolerance is a logical outcome of corporatization. The private sector has no tradition or recognition of freedom of expression and workers are generally not permitted to criticize their employers in public. In the context of universities, US courts have recently ruled that academics who speak publicly against their institutions are not protected under academic freedom. In Canada, the right to criticize a university administration is expressly incorporated into faculty collective agreements across the country, but there have been efforts to circumvent the application of this legal protection. For example, the AUCC’s new “Statement on Academic Freedom” (2011b) makes no reference to the right to criticize one’s institution (for commentary, see CAUT 2011b). Corporatization also impacts academic freedom in other ways. In his work, Kenneth Westhues (2004) shows how academics who raise questions about the policies, priorities or partnerships of their universities can become victims of “administrative mobbing.” Penalties for speaking out can include threats to tenure and promotion,¹⁸³ public vilification or even dismissal. Westhues uses the firing of University of Ottawa professor Denis Rancourt as a recent example. In Rancourt’s case,

¹⁸³ There is evidence to suggest that some Canadian universities consider institutional image to be a factor in tenure and promotion decisions (a longstanding practice in US universities). According to the Carleton University Academic Staff Association (CUASA), for example, the Carleton administration recently tabled a proposal wherein the “status and reputation” of Carleton University would function as a basis for consideration of a candidate’s tenure (see CUASA 2010).

his dismissal was said to be related to his grading scheme and pedagogical methods, but it is likely that his public criticism of the University of Ottawa under President Allan Rock – including how the institution’s corporate orientation led to administrative malfeasance – played a role in the decision (see Westhues 2009).¹⁸⁴

A second case was the administrative crackdown that took place at York University several years ago. In response to student unrest in 2004, the York administration overhauled the university’s Temporary Use of Space Policy by outlawing any unauthorized use of university buildings and restricting freedom of assembly. The administration also stipulated that permission was needed to bring guest speakers to York. As Noble (2005: 24) explains it, “in the manner of all private-sector owners and managers, [the administration] deemed the physical plant of the university – that is, the university campus – to be ‘private property’ and formulated official policy on its use.”¹⁸⁵ The following year, police were invited onto campus by the administration and subsequently violently dispersed student demonstrations that were protesting, among other things, the corporate representation on York’s Board of Governors. According to Howard Woodhouse (2009: 237-238), these student actions were deemed to be “a threat to York’s relations with powerful business interests” and administrative intervention was meant to “stem their opposition to the corporate agenda.”

¹⁸⁴ For Rancourt’s account of his treatment by the University of Ottawa administration, see rancourt.academicfreedom.ca/component/content/article/52.html

¹⁸⁵ These measures were not simply scare tactics, as evidenced by the intimidation and disciplining of student activists who attempted to distribute leaflets and organize demonstrations without authorization. It was in this context that Dan Freeman-Maloy, an activist and undergraduate student at York, was suspended for three years by University President Lorna Marsden. The official charge against Freeman-Maloy was “unlawful use of a megaphone,” but many familiar with the incident insist that his suspension resulted from his outspoken political views in support of Palestinian rights and his public criticism of the administration.

In addition to protecting their own brands, shielding corporate sponsors from criticism has become a high priority for administrators. It was this concern that motivated the University of Ottawa to prevent a prominent Burmese human rights activist from speaking on campus in 2007. The subject of the activist's talk was the unethical Burmese business activities of Total SA, a French oil company whose board members included the wealthy Desmarais family, one of the university's largest benefactors. According to documents obtained by the Canadian Friends of Burma through access to information requests, members of the senior administration devised an assortment of strategies to block the event. In internal correspondence, university officials appeared to be aware that they were violating elementary codes of academic freedom in the service of their corporate sponsor; in an email to then university president Gilles Patry, one vice president noted that preventing the talk "flies in the face of many principles we hold dear in the University world, but I think we have other interests at stake" (Morgan 2010). Other prominent academic freedom cases that can be traced to corporatization include that of David Noble – whose activism against university restructuring led administrators at Simon Fraser University to block his appointment to the J.S. Woodsworth Chair of the Humanities.¹⁸⁶

These changes to academic freedom align with broader political efforts to transform the university. Notably, the events of 9-11 have been exploited by elite interests and other reactionary forces to justify the suppression of dissent on campuses. This offensive by

¹⁸⁶ Despite the fact that the official search committee for the prestigious SFU Chair unanimously recommended Noble for the position and the Humanities Department overwhelmingly endorsed it, the SFU administration intervened to block it. A subsequent investigation into the incident launched by the CAUT documented clear violations of Noble's academic freedom and the university eventually apologized for its actions as part of an out of court settlement.

private advocacy groups, conservative media watchdogs and campus “monitoring” organizations is especially concerning because it reaches directly into the classroom; it has been directed not only against “dissenting professors and academic freedom but also over who controls the hiring process, the organization of curricula, and the nature of pedagogy itself” (Giroux 2007a: 141). As an example, conservative activist David Horowitz and his Freedom Centre campaigned to impose an “Academic Bill of Rights” on universities. The essence of this Bill was that faculty and course offerings must be “balanced” – a requirement that some feared “might force evolutionary biologists to teach intelligent design or historians the virtues of slavery” (Schrecker 2010: 146). In the mid-2000s, about 20 state legislatures in the US were considering Horowitz’s proposal. Universities are also being pressured to depoliticize their curriculums. Typical of this viewpoint is Tom Flanagan, former professor of political science at the University of Calgary. Flanagan (2007: 27) has mocked the “faux disciplines” of “women’s studies, native studies, queer studies, and cultural studies, which have been invented to get around the objective standards of the traditional disciplines.” Practitioners in these fields, says Flanagan, “practice advocacy scholarship in support of social movements,” creating a “monolithic” climate of intellectual leftism. Likewise Stanley Fish (2008) argues that academics should “save the world on their own time,” and that too many professors are engaged in social activism and a moralistic form of pedagogy that amounts to political indoctrination.

Limiting the boundaries of discussion on Middle East politics has been a cornerstone of efforts to delegitimize independent and dissident academics. Accordingly, some of the most significant campaigns (often involving allegations of anti-semitism)

have been waged against Middle Eastern scholars, nearly all of them critical of Israel's policies in the Occupied Territories. The treatment of Norman Finkelstein and his tenure denial at DePaul University is one of the most well-cited examples of how the career of a leading scholar can be derailed by these kinds of attacks (see, for example, Abraham 2011; Harvey 2008).¹⁸⁷ The politicization of the Israel-Palestine conflict has also had an impact on Canadian campuses. Consistent with the Conservative government's record on academic freedom, in 2009 Minister Gary Goodyear's office threatened to withhold federal funding for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council over its decision to fund an academic conference at York entitled "Israel/Palestine: Mapping Models of Statehood and Paths to Peace" (see Thompson 2011).¹⁸⁸ Attempts to restrict the boundaries of debate have also included repeated efforts to ban Israeli Apartheid Week events as well as attacks on the Sociology and Equity Studies program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) regarding the thesis project of graduate student Jenny Peto (CAUT 2011a; Nadeau and Sears 2011).

¹⁸⁷ Many of the scholars listed in David Horowitz's book, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America* (2006) are located in fields like Ethnic Studies and write about issues related to Islam and the Middle East. These academics are characterized as sympathetic to terrorism and non-democratic governments. Campus Watch, a project of the Middle East Forum, also devotes itself to monitoring "biased" academics. Other high profile targets of these campaigns have included Professors John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt (*The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* 2007) and former US President Jimmy Carter (*Palestine, Peace Not Apartheid* 2006).

¹⁸⁸ Minister Goodyear's intervention fits within the Conservative government's record of silencing critics of its general policy positions. For example, the government's position on freedom of speech was revealed in 2009 when British MP George Galloway, a critic of the Israeli occupation and of Western military intervention in Afghanistan, was banned from entering Canada on grounds of national security (a claim that made Canada the object of international ridicule). Academic scholarship and scientific research have also been subjected to unprecedented political scrutiny. Professors critical of Conservative government policies have been targeted in the media and by party spokespersons. This kind of inspection extends to the government's own academics. Scientists working for Natural Resources Canada were informed in 2010 that they would be required to obtain "pre-approval" from the Minister's office before speaking to the media (Gergin 2011). Efforts by the government to muzzle its own scientists and suppress scientific debate on issues of public interest have recently drawn international criticism (Ghosh 2012). There has also been domestic backlash. In the summer of 2012, 1,500 scientists, students and supporters rallied on Parliament Hill to protest the government's attack on scientific research and the preferential cutting of programs that do not align with the Conservative agenda.

Campaigns to restrict dissent and academic autonomy have a number of impacts. For one, they promote a narrow, vocational conception of university education, at the same time as reconstituting the campus as an apolitical and corporatized space. Further, the idea that there is an ingrained ideological bias among the professoriate has reinforced the assumption that academics regularly violate reasonable standards of professionalism under the guise of free expression and, therefore, must be held more “accountable” for their teaching and scholarship. The university’s growing reliance on private funding only makes them more vulnerable to these kinds of political pressures.

Just as corporatization has created these divisions between university management and academic workers, it has also created divisions within and between university units. In the final section of this chapter, I discuss the role of university administrations and public-private partnerships in reshaping academic programs and curriculums.

Curriculum Reform, Campus Infrastructure and Corporate Control

Within the rubric of corporatization, a centralized management structure is seen as being less burdened by collegial decision-making and having benefits beyond increased efficiencies and economic returns. Proponents claim, for example, that popular and economically relevant fields of study would not have emerged if administrators lacked the power and flexibility to divert scarce resources and deploy faculty to areas of high demand. According to the Business-Higher Education Forum (2001), programs like computer science would have languished if professors controlled the curriculum.

Similarly, in a paper produced in association with the World Bank, D. Bruce Johnstone (1998: 24) claims that academics resist curricular reform by drawing upon “the idea of

the university as a proper and necessary bastion of continuity and tradition; the tradition of academic freedom” and an army of “politically volatile” students who are easily enlisted to support the status quo. Milton Greenburg (2004) goes further, arguing that professors draw upon a “university is not a business” mantra whenever administrators push for market reforms, which then shields them from reasonable standards of service and accountability. Implicit in all of these arguments is the idea that faculty are too self-interested and/or backward thinking to make decisions in the interests of the university, its students and the economy, and therefore that curricular decisions should be made by business-minded administrators. In line with these assumptions is the notion that job training should take precedence over the goals and values of a liberal education. As a result, academic departments more removed from labour and commercial markets have been deemed less important to the university’s mission, which has led to greater differentiation by program and an inequitable distribution of funding. On campuses across the country, the neglect of liberal arts programs has been accompanied by the growth and construction of new management schools, medical research labs, engineering facilities and other “relevant” curricula and infrastructure.

University Curriculums and the Fate of the Liberal Arts

As student enrolment numbers have shifted from basic arts and sciences to more practical, applied and business-related fields, so too have the types of programs provided by universities. In part, this shift from liberal arts to career focused programs is premised on the notion of a “skills gap” in the Canadian economy. Since the early 1990s, business groups, politicians and the media have promoted the idea that our universities and training programs are not producing enough highly skilled graduates (see Barlow and

Robertson 1994; Sears 2003). Federal Human Resources Minister Diane Finley recently referred to the labour and skills shortage as “the most significant socio-economic challenge ahead of us in Canada” (Weston 2013). According to one Conservative insider, “there are too many kids getting BAs and not enough welders.” Yet, there is reason to question the legitimacy of such claims. For one, Canada produces more post-secondary graduates than ever, and a large proportion of these are college graduates. In fact, in 2010 Canada had the highest college graduation rate among OECD countries, a ranking it has held for many years (OECD 2012b).

Rather than there being a shortage of skills or skilled graduates, it may be more accurate to say that there is a shortage of high quality jobs and that many Canadian workers are over-qualified for their jobs and under-employed (see Livingstone 1996, 1999; Stanford 2001).¹⁸⁹ Further, when compared with university graduates from other disciplines, liberal arts graduates have performed well in the Canadian labour market (Anisef, Axelrod and Lin 1999; Axelrod 2002; Council of Ontario Universities 2011b, 2012; Liu, McCloy and DeClou 2012). In fact, the gap between income and job prospects for humanities graduates versus science (or even high-tech) graduates is significantly lower than the gap between university graduates and individuals without a university degree. It is also worth noting that a paper commissioned by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) found that “social sciences and humanities-based industries” account for more than three quarters of all employment in Canada and that these disciplines influence more than \$388 billion in economic activity, which is roughly

¹⁸⁹ Part of the explanation for the under-utilization of skills is that many Canadian businesses refuse to redesign production processes to improve productivity through higher skill requirements because of cost. Instead, they have taken the easy route of downsizing, restructuring and moving production out of Canada.

equivalent to the amount influenced by science, technology, engineering and medicine (Impact Group 2008). While the importance of the liberal arts cannot and should not be measured primarily by economic or employment criteria, these trends run counter to the widely-held assumption that a liberal arts education has little “value” in today’s economy.

The rhetoric of a skills gap and the irrelevance of the liberal arts has, at least in part, been employed as a political tactic to restructure university education to areas in demand by dominant business sectors. Not only are universities devoting more resources to vocational and applied fields, but liberal arts programs are moving in a more marketable direction in order to sell themselves (e.g., sociology departments that offer new specializations in applied criminology) and increase the “applicability” of their degrees (e.g., the addition of new “Business and Society” courses). This utilitarian approach has also influenced how money is distributed to the arts through external research bodies. A good example was the announcement in the 2009 federal budget that scholarships granted by the SSHRC would be focused on “business-related degrees.” No area of study is more threatened under corporatization than the humanities. Despite moderate enrolment increases in recent years, humanities programs have been downgraded, and books and articles documenting their incompatibility with neoliberal restructuring now saturate the academic and popular presses (e.g., Burgan 2008; Cohen 2009; Copping 2011; Donoghue 2008; Mignolo 2003). In contrast, courses and programs that are seen as augmenting university revenues (usually those curriculum streams most attractive to profit-generating foreign students) are being expanded and prioritized. To this end, many universities have introduced new and exclusive “boutique” programs, such as executive MBA degrees. As

Erika Shaker (1999) documented years ago, MBA and executive MBA programs in Canada have become important “status symbols” for corporatizing universities and are developed in close consultation with the private sector.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, the expansion and proliferation of business schools has been at the forefront of many trends that have taken shape under corporatization, including

the push for more professional education, donor-driven expansion, responsiveness to student and employer demands, highly integrated business-campus relations, high tuition fees for market-based programs, greater autonomy for professional schools, unequal distribution of resources on campuses, the marginalization of traditional disciplines, the rise of new commercially based research and teaching, and increased student emphasis on career opportunities (Coates and Morrison 2011: 61).

University administrations share much of the responsibility for the recent proliferation of corporatized curriculums. Just as corporate managers tend to downsize or eliminate unprofitable branches of their companies, university managers are doing the same with those faculties and programs with limited revenue or market potential. For example, the University of Alberta recently announced that it is suspending admission to 20 programs within the Faculty of Arts. This decision followed the elimination of 100 sections of arts courses over the previous year (Migdal 2013). These assumptions also underlie recent administrative initiatives such as “resource optimization” programs as well as new cost-cutting exercises known as “program prioritization” that place a heavy emphasis on program cost, student demand and student outcomes (see Bradshaw

¹⁹⁰ This collaboration includes MBA degrees offered in conjunction with professional organizations (e.g., UQAM and Dalhousie’s MBA in financial services produced with the Institute of Canadian Bankers) and events such as “CEO Back to Campus” days where business schools bring top business leaders to campus in order to “cement ties to corporate Canada” (Shaker 1999: viii).

2012).¹⁹¹ Similarly, some university administrations have adopted a “profit-centre” model of governance, where individual academic units are treated as self-contained entities and are expected to pay their own way by chasing outside funding and increasing student headcounts. A variation of this model was recently adopted by the University of Toronto. Faculties at the university now retain most of the revenues they generate and are required to pay for the use of common university services out of their own operating budgets. This strategy incentivizes the maximization of revenues by individual faculties.¹⁹² Although the university has counterbalanced these changes with some measures to maintain equity, the new model clearly provides an advantage to those faculties (such as business schools) that are able to generate outside funding and charge higher fees.¹⁹³

Governments have also played a role in redefining curricular relevance by assuming greater control over academic programs. In Manitoba, for example, legislation was passed requiring provincial approval for any alteration of a university program. In the late 1990s, the government of Ontario initiated the Access to Opportunity Program, which aimed to “double the pipeline of computer science and engineering graduates” in the province (Jones and Young 2004: 199). The Alberta government has also introduced funding and other mechanisms to ensure that new programs correspond with labour

¹⁹¹ Guelph’s faculty association recently published a series of bulletins (2013a; 2013b; 2013c) outlining its concerns with program prioritization reviews.

¹⁹² This approach likely contributed to the proposed “disestablishment” of the U of T’s Centre for Comparative Literature in 2010. The plan to close the Centre was only repealed after students, faculty and others launched a public media campaign to defend it (Pitas 2010).

¹⁹³ At some universities, a “profit-centre” model has been extended to academics. At Texas A&M University in the US, faculty evaluations now take into account how much money professors generate in their teaching and research activities. According to this entrepreneurial logic, good faculty “performance” means that a professor has produced more wealth for the university than he or she was paid in salary. The quality of one’s teaching and research does not enter into the equation, except in so far as it generates additional income. To help quantify this measure of academic efficiency, the administration has produced a profit and loss statement – or cost-benefit balance sheet – for every faculty member (Simon and Banchemo 2010).

market needs (as defined by the government). Most recently in 2013, the government announced it would be sending “mandate letters” to all colleges and universities to specify their roles and the government’s expectations of them (Charbonneau and Tamburri 2013). Sometimes government intervention extends beyond program oversight. In 1999, for example, the government of British Columbia granted university status to the Technical University of British Columbia (TUBC). During its time in operation, this “university” functioned like a high technology online diploma mill supplying corporations with “just-in-time” employees. In response, the CAUT launched an international boycott of the TUBC on the grounds that it sacrificed academic freedom and intellectual integrity to corporate interests.

Some would argue that putting the blame on university administrators and governments deflects attention away from the real source of the problem: increasing corporate control over higher education. It is true that corporate sponsors have become more actively involved in the development of university curricula. Industry scientists now regularly visit campuses and sponsor university conferences and workshops. Work placement programs, business internships and industry-sponsored courses are also on the rise. At the same time, there is no shortage of business commentators calling for a university system driven by market forces and corporate demand. In these ways, the corporate sector obstructs universities from being able to develop credible long-term academic programs, as it calls on them to respond in an almost “Pavlovian way” to perceived labour market needs (Axelrod 2002: 82). Yet, the perspectives of business managers are not entirely uniform. Many of today’s business leaders support liberal arts programs. In 2000, for example, the CEOs of 30 Canadian corporations issued a public

statement endorsing the liberal arts. This kind of testimony from individual business leaders reinforces the conclusion that the creative skills and general talents of liberal arts graduates are still valued in the private sector (see University of Toronto 2008c).¹⁹⁴ Of course, sentiments by business leaders extolling the virtues of the liberal arts operate more in theory than in practice. As one former university vice-president puts it: “On Friday [a business executive] will speak in glowing terms of the value of the humanities. On Monday morning the money goes to engineering” (Axelrod 1998: 9). Whatever the ultimate source of curriculum reform under corporatization, private sector interests and values are increasingly shaping university disciplines, programs and course offerings. This influence can be further illustrated by looking at two other recent developments: the expansion of public-private partnerships in university infrastructure and the proliferation of donor agreements. The next two sections review each of these in turn.

Structured Inequalities: Capital Funding and Public-Private Partnerships

Public-private partnerships (P3s) have become increasingly important in the delivery of public services in Canada (see Loxley 2010). Although citizens and taxpayers have the greatest stake in P3s and are largely responsible for funding them, the public is not a “partner” in any meaningful way. In reality, P3s are side deals between political parties and corporations in which corporations are afforded lucrative investment opportunities at low risk, and gain access to the physical and social infrastructure of public services at little cost. In the context of higher education, P3s shift research and infrastructure

¹⁹⁴ In the words of Thomas D’Aquino, former head of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives: “Even as business leaders talk of the need for relevance of education to the job market, many have been expressing strong public support for the traditional liberal arts, which are at least as relevant today as they were a century ago. That is precisely because they teach young people how to think rather than attempting to instill in them a specific of soon-to-be-obsolete knowledge” (cited in D’Aquino and Stewart-Patterson 2001: 116).

development toward those areas favoured by the private sector and allow corporations to appropriate the intellectual infrastructure of educational institutions.

Within Canadian universities, capital funding is used for the expansion of (or major renovations to) campus infrastructure. Universities rely on a number of sources to finance capital projects. Provincial governments often provide the majority of this funding, or it is paid through a combination of government funding and the universities themselves, often through fundraising. Capital funding for universities increased considerably over the 2000s. Its growth was largely a result of three initiatives: (i) a one-time jump in capital funding for Ontario universities under the SuperBuild program; (ii) funding for research infrastructure provided by the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI), and (iii) the federal government's Knowledge Infrastructure Program (KIP). What makes SuperBuild, the CFI and the KIP so significant is that they are all "matching" programs. That is, each of these programs was designed to function like P3s and secure matching funds from the private sector.

SuperBuild

From 1999 to 2003, the Ontario SuperBuild program funded dozens of infrastructure projects on university campuses. Most of the required matching contributions were provided by corporations and wealthy individuals. As a result, funding for programs that provided the greatest strategic advantages to business were favoured over those areas deemed to be less profitable. For example, in 1999-2000, the 24 percent of students in engineering, computer science and business received 51 percent of SuperBuild funds and 62 percent of money from the private sector. The 18 percent of students in the natural and health sciences received 28 and 25 percent respectively (Robertson, McGrane and Shaker

2003). In contrast, the social sciences and humanities received just three percent of SuperBuild funds and 0.8 percent of private sector funds, even though more than 40 percent of students in Ontario universities were enrolled in these disciplines. Similarly, the fine arts received two percent of SuperBuild funds and 1.8 percent of private sector funds; libraries were given 0.14 and 0.18 percent; and education received nothing from either source. Although the private sector did not provide all the funding for these projects, the structure of the program gave it de facto control over infrastructure development on Ontario campuses, including how *public* money was allocated. Corporate control was only strengthened by the fact that many powerful Canadian companies – such as the Toronto Dominion Bank and Bell Canada – were represented on SuperBuild’s advisory board.

The Canadian Foundation for Innovation

The Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) is an independent corporation that was established by the federal government in 1997. Its goal is to help universities and other research institutions modernize their research infrastructure. Generally speaking, the CFI pays 40 percent of university infrastructure costs for a program it funds, while universities and other partners cover the remaining 60 percent. Applications for CFI funding are assessed on the basis of need, as well as their potential to strengthen the capacity for “innovation” and potential benefits to Canada. Thus, universities seeking CFI funding must compete not only for CFI awards, but also for the 60 percent of matching funds that must be raised from governments, corporations or individuals. Overall, these matching contributions have amounted to billions of dollars in new money, which has essentially guaranteed dependence on the private sector.

Like SuperBuild, the CFI program has a “structural” preference for infrastructure projects in certain disciplines. For example, between 1998 and 2009, the CFI disbursed over \$4.2 billion to various projects. Overall, approximately 90 percent of this funding went to the natural sciences and engineering and the health sciences (this figure is actually closer to 95 percent because the “multidisciplinary” category is composed mainly of projects that are rooted in the natural sciences, engineering, and health sciences). Moreover, these disciplines accounted for 5,590 out of 6,310 funded projects. In contrast, arts and literature and the humanities and social sciences received just five percent of funds, despite representing a majority of all research appointments (Guppy, Grabb and Mollica 2013).¹⁹⁵ Total CFI funding allocations by knowledge area is outlined in Table 7.2. This disparity has reinforced the shift from basic to applied/commercial research in Canada (discussed in the next chapter), and has allowed the CFI and its “partners” to gain considerable leverage over curriculum priorities.

The Knowledge Infrastructure Program

The Knowledge Infrastructure Program (KIP) was announced as part of the 2009 federal budget. Administered by Industry Canada, the program allocated roughly \$2 billion to support hundreds of post-secondary infrastructure projects as part of the government’s economic stimulus plan. On the one hand, the KIP provided much needed material resources to Canadian campuses. On the other hand, it did little to address the gap in core funding across universities and its projects have primarily been oriented towards providing a “foundation for future economic prosperity” (Industry Canada 2012a).

¹⁹⁵ In fact, these figures likely obscure more inequality in funding distribution because of project misclassification. For example, according to Guppy, Grabb and Mollica (2013), about one third of CFI money going to “arts and literature” is misclassified on the official CFI spreadsheet.

Table 7.2
CFI Funding by Discipline, 1998 to 2009

Area	No. of Projects	Total Funds (\$)	% of Funds
Arts and Literature	73	39,709,673	0.9
Health Sciences	1,177	1,394,523,033	32.5
Humanities and Social Sciences	561	176,315,717	4.1
Multidisciplinary	86	200,634,279	4.7
Natural Sciences and Engineering	4,413	2,473,718,765	57.7
Total	6,310	4,284,901,467	100

Source: Guppy, Neil, Edward Grabb and Clayton Mollica. 2013. "The Canada Foundation for Innovation, Sociology of Knowledge, and the Re-engineering of the University."

KIP money was leveraged into an investment of more than \$3 billion from municipalities, provinces and the private sector, resulting in a total investment of more than \$5 billion.

Like SuperBuild and the CFI, the KIP inherently favours projects that can amass matching funds. At the University of Western Ontario, for example, KIP funding for the new \$100 million Richard Ivey School of Business was chosen over a variety of other proposals. Other examples of KIP funded projects in Ontario include: the Biosciences and Technology Convergence Centre at Algoma; the Energy Systems and Nuclear Science Research Centre and the Automotive Centre of Excellence at UOIT; the Innovation Centre for Canadian Mining Industry at Toronto; the Balsillie Centre of Excellence at Waterloo; the Centre for Engineering Innovation at Windsor; and the new Life Sciences Building At York (Council of Ontario Universities 2010a). Brock's KIP showpiece is the \$111 million Cairns Family Health and Bioscience Complex. The

ground floor of this complex houses Brock's business incubator, where faculty and business leaders work together to market their discoveries.¹⁹⁶ Two more aspects of the KIP program are worth noting. First, the majority of KIP money has gone to infrastructure repairs and upgrades to existing campus facilities and not new infrastructure. According to the CAUT (2009c), less than half of what the government stated it was investing in higher education infrastructure actually went to new projects. Second, many new projects financed under the KIP program have involved private colleges and universities in Canada.

Deferred Maintenance and "Hidden" Costs

One reason why a large portion of KIP money – and other public funds – has been diverted to infrastructure upgrades is because university infrastructure in Canada has suffered from prolonged neglect. In 2009, the Canadian Association of University Business Officers estimated that the total value of deferred maintenance on Canadian campuses was over \$5 billion (representing a 35 percent increase in less than a decade), half of which is considered "urgent." In fact, university budgets are so strained that deferred maintenance poses "serious health and safety risks" at many institutions (CFS 2012: 9). Likewise in Ontario, a 2007 report showed that nearly half of the total space in the province's universities is classified as operating in poor condition (Council of Ontario Universities 2010b). P3s and matching programs have contributed to this problem. While some programs and disciplines are being equipped with new state of the art facilities, libraries and other publicly-funded infrastructure that house most of the teaching and

¹⁹⁶Interestingly, KIP-sponsored business incubation facilities are most prevalent in Quebec. Twenty-six percent (\$118.9 million) of KIP funding in Quebec was spent on business incubation projects, compared with just 12 percent in the rest of the country (Industry Canada 2012b).

research space for arts, education and the social sciences have been excluded from this support.

Infrastructure projects also come with “hidden costs.” In part, this is because funding for the operation, staffing and maintenance of new buildings is often entirely absent. New KIP projects, for example, do not generally account for operating expenses. Likewise, the CFI provides funding for construction, with only a small amount for operations.¹⁹⁷ As a result, the ongoing costs of maintenance must be absorbed by universities. Staffing and maintenance costs for campus infrastructure in Canada amount to more than \$1 billion annually, and capital projects based on a P3 model have only increased this burden. In order to finance these costs, universities are dipping into their general-purpose and operating budgets. This means that some of the money that once supported arts-related disciplines is being diverted to servicing infrastructure in applied fields.¹⁹⁸ Some universities are also incurring considerable debts because they are unable to meet fundraising targets. According to the AUCC (2008a: 40), the “increase in debt servicing of academic buildings is the result of government practices to leverage as much private sector funding as possible in support of university construction.” The annual cost of debt servicing – which has grown substantially in recent years – also reduces the amount of money available to cover teaching and other expenses.

There is no question that applied and high-technology programs require more expensive facilities and infrastructure than other disciplines. Under corporatization,

¹⁹⁷ In 2010, the CFI began to address the issue of operating expenses when it launched its first major competition for operating funds. The Major Science Initiatives program provided \$185 million over five years to cover 40 percent of the operating costs (for up to five years) of science facilities that the organization had already funded.

¹⁹⁸ P3s are also associated by unexpected cost overruns that make them inherently risky. Several years ago, police in Montreal were brought in to investigate why a partnered real estate deal at UQAM had driven the university to the brink of bankruptcy (CUPE 2008a, 2009a).

however, the inequality in infrastructure spending and development on Canadian campuses has become much more pronounced. Programs in the arts, social sciences and humanities cannot compete when funding arrangements are based upon public-private partnerships and matching contributions from the private sector. The examples of capital funding explored here are clear illustrations of how corporations and neoliberal governments are assuming greater control over university governance.

Donor Agreements

Another way that the private sector is asserting its influence over university governance is through donor agreements. As we have seen, Canadian universities are increasingly turning to private donors to compensate for public funding shortfalls. In exchange for monetary contributions, private donors are often offered seats on university governing boards and their names are emblazoned on academic chairs, institutes, faculties, buildings and lecture halls. In *The Trouble with Billionaires*, Linda McQuaig and Neil Brooks (2010: 192) note that in contrast to past years, when buildings were often named in honour of distinguished academics, today “campus buildings and auditoriums have been named almost exclusively after people whose distinctive characteristic is the possession of lots of money.” Examples include the K.C. Irving Chemistry Centre at the University of Prince Edward Island, the Schulich School of Business at York, the Michael G. DeGroote School of Medicine at McMaster, the Clayton H. Riddell Faculty of Environment, Earth and Resources at the University of Manitoba and the Wayne & William White Engineering Design Centre at the University of British Columbia.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁹ McQuaig and Brooks also note that in 2007, a group of professors at the U of T approached the administration with the idea of naming the university’s Health Studies Program after Tommy Douglas, a Canadian healthcare pioneer who was selected the “Greatest Canadian” of all time in a nationwide contest

Some argue that naming university buildings after rich donors is of little consequence. Yet, corporate and other wealthy patrons – who Jacques Barzun (1993: 157-158) once described as “danglers of gifts” and “false friends”²⁰⁰ – are not simply being granted naming rights. They are now claiming, and in some cases being allowed, control over academic decision-making in the university. Under corporatization, there are many examples of universities entering into contracts with private donors that grant them considerable control over academic priorities. In the US, for example, prominent bankers and financial institutions have donated heavily to dozens of colleges and universities to develop programs on entrepreneurialism and right-wing economic philosophy. One of these deals included a course on “the moral foundations of capitalism,” where students were required to read Ayn Rand’s *Atlas Shrugged* and Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* (Tedesco 2012). In 2011, another problematic deal between billionaire Charles Koch and Florida State University allowed Koch to decide on new hires for an economics program promoting free market capitalism (Hundley 2011). The Centre for American Progress has also exposed how agreements between US universities and major energy corporations have compromised academic integrity (Washburn 2010). These agreements have troubling implications for university curriculums, academic staffing and academic freedom. They also mean that universities are not merely being run more like businesses; they are increasingly being run *by* members of the private sector.

organized by the CBC. In its response, the university turned down the proposal because it offered little potential for fundraising.

²⁰⁰ In *The American University*, first published in 1968, Jacques Barzun warned about the impacts that outside donors had on universities. Some donors, Barzun said, acted like part-time administrators who attempted to “manage” their donations indefinitely, an intrusion he characterized as a “cancer.”

In Canada, four donor agreements at the University of Toronto (U of T) in the 1990s are indicative of the changing relationship between universities and the private sector. First, in 1995, Canadian business icon Peter Munk donated \$6.4 million over 10 years to finance the Munk Centre for International Studies. In return, Munk was afforded preferential allocation of university resources. Under the agreement, Munk was also free to withdraw his donation at any time if he was dissatisfied with the Centre's "progress." Second, in 1996, the Joseph L. Rotman Charitable Foundation pledged \$15 million to the university's Faculty of Management in return for matching funds to create six new endowed chairs. The deal also came with a number of other privileges, including control over faculty hiring; committing future university resources to donor prerogatives; and allowing the foundation to redirect its funds (*and* the university's matching funds) to other purposes. This agreement was only terminated after protests by students and the U of T Faculty Association. Third, the U of T signed an agreement in 1997 with Nortel to set up the Nortel Institute for Telecommunications. In exchange for \$8 million, Nortel was given influence over hiring for the new Institute, which also gave it *de facto* control over curriculum and instruction. It was later revealed that faculty and students were required, by virtue of a secret clause in the agreement, to sign over to Nortel exclusive rights to research and inventions produced with Nortel money. This provision allowed Nortel to effectively own – and commercially exploit – all intellectual property that resulted from the research it funded. Fourth, a \$13.5 million agreement with Bell Emergis (a division of Bell Canada) in 1999 created four matching-fund chairs and four tenure track positions in the Bell Emergis University Labs. This gave Bell significant control over hiring and research. The university also assured the company that faculty

researchers would be required to sign over their intellectual property rights to the university – which in turn would be transferred to Bell – in order to be considered for funding under the agreement (for more detailed information on these agreements, see Cole 1998; Graham 2000; Woodhouse 2009). Today’s donor agreements are even more threatening to university autonomy and integrity. In the last several years, three agreements have been particularly criticized. Each of these deals will be discussed in turn.

The Munk School of Global Affairs

The Munk School of Global Affairs came into force 15 years after the deal that established the Munk Centre for International Studies was signed. Munk agreed to donate \$35 million to the University of Toronto over a period of seven years to establish the new school. Of course, Munk will not pay the full amount, as he will receive a \$16 million tax reduction for his \$35 million contribution, reducing his actual contribution to \$19 million (McQuaig and Brooks 2010). This means that Munk’s “donation” is actually split between his foundation and the Canadian taxpayer. As well, the Federal and Ontario governments each promised \$25 million in matching funds, so the taxpayers’ actual contribution is at least \$66 million. When a copy of the agreement was released (see University of Toronto 2010), critics charged that Munk was effectively buying influence over academic decisions. Although the contract affirms both parties’ commitment to “vigilant protection for the rights of freedom of speech, academic freedom and freedom of research,” this conflicts with another provision requiring the school’s director to provide detailed annual reports to the Munk Board of Directors (p. 3, 10). The reason for the conflict is that a major portion of Munk’s money is only released after the Board is

satisfied that the school has achieved certain donor-defined objectives. Furthermore, Munk has the authority to withdraw funds over any aspect of the school with which he disapproves. Given the money at stake, the university will be unlikely to resist any demand made by Munk or risk alienating the corporations he controls. Munk already requires that the school include space and offices for members of the Canadian International Council, a right-leaning think tank specializing in foreign affairs. And, given Munk's connection to mining giant Barrick Gold, it is unlikely that the school will conduct any research that is critical of the crimes of Canadian mining companies.

The Balsillie School of International Affairs

In 2007, co-founder of Research in Motion, Jim Balsillie, donated \$33 million to Wilfrid Laurier and Waterloo universities to establish the Balsillie School of International Affairs. The money was donated through Balsillie's private think tank, the Waterloo-based Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI). One of the disturbing aspects of this agreement was that it gave Balsillie influence over the school's hiring, budgeting, research and curriculum decisions. In large part, this was because the committees that were established to make academic decisions contained both university and CIGI representatives and required unanimity, which meant that the CIGI had veto power over academic matters normally reserved for universities. The CAUT began investigating the agreement after Ramesh Thakur was fired from his position as the school's inaugural director (see Findlay 2010). Thakur claims he was fired because he resisted CIGI's intention to assert greater control over academic affairs, and stated that "[h]ad it been clear to me that the school was a wholly owned subsidiary of CIGI, I would never have taken the job" (cited in Valpy 2010).

It should also be noted that in 2012, another \$60 million agreement was signed between CIGI and York University to establish a joint program in international law. This partnership arrangement, which included a \$30 million contribution from both the Ontario government and CIGI, also ostensibly gave the think tank veto power over budgetary matters, academic staffing, curriculum and research (Tedesco 2012). And, like many of the agreements previously discussed, Balsillie was given the freedom to pull his money if CIGI was not satisfied with the direction of the program. In this case, however, the deal was cancelled after widespread opposition from Osgoode Law School faculty (Brown 2012b).

The Clayton H. Riddell School of Political Management

In 2012, Carleton University signed a \$15 million donor agreement with Calgary oil magnate and former chair of the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Clayton Riddell, to create the Clayton H. Riddell School of Political Management. The \$15 million provided by Riddell was the largest single donation ever provided to the university. From the outset, the Carleton administration was highly secretive about the deal, which was brokered by former Reform Party leader Preston Manning. When the particulars of the agreement were requested under Ontario's Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, the administration refused to provide it. Following mediation, the university released a heavily redacted version of the agreement and, after stalling for nearly a year, was eventually ordered to release the full contract by Ontario's information and privacy commissioner. The contract revealed that Riddell's foundation effectively appointed three of the five members of the program's steering committee. Manning chairs the committee while his former chief of staff Cliff Fryers and Chris Froggatt

(former chief of staff to Conservative cabinet minister John Baird) are also represented. This committee was initially given “sweeping power” over the program’s budget, hiring and curriculum (see Cheadle 2012a; Henderson 2012). And like the agreements noted above, a provision in the contract allowed Riddell’s foundation to assess the school’s performance after a period of time and withhold the remaining \$10 million if was not satisfied with any aspect of its performance. The CAUT described the Carleton agreement as “unprecedented” (Cheadle 2012b). After an outpouring of public opposition, Carleton announced that the deal did not reflect the university’s academic policies with regard to budget management and staff selection and would be renegotiated. Under the revised agreement, the steering committee no longer has the power to “approve” hiring and curriculum decisions and assumes a more advisory role.

These kinds of private donor deals in the Canadian context are indicative of and in line with other changes discussed throughout this chapter. To review, the ascendancy of corporate management in higher education has been accompanied by a change in how universities are governed, a proliferation of corporate governance models informed by discourses and practices of managerialism, the rise of a new marketing ethos and a decline in academic freedom, changes in programs and curriculum offerings, and a series of new public-private partnerships. The next chapter looks, in detail, at another area where corporatization has introduced significant changes in the academy: research.

Chapter Eight: Innovation, Commercialization and the Corporate Corruption of Academic Research

As discussed throughout this study, universities have long had both teaching and research as core functions. Just as corporatization has influenced both who teaches and what gets taught, so too have there been changes in who is directing research and what gets released. Historically, university research has been tied to the needs and interests of external powers, with the strength of these ties and their implications for knowledge production depending on the broader social and economic context. In the 1960s and 1970s, there was relatively little collaboration between Canadian academics and members of the business community. This lack of engagement can be traced, in part, to corporate reservations about the nature of university research, including the “standards and procedures for performance and evaluation; the procedures for circulating results; and the system of rewards” (MacAulay 1984: 78).²⁰¹ It also resulted from the university’s relative independence as an institution. As Polster (1998) explains, most university research during this period was organized along disciplinary lines and regulated by academics independently of other social actors. Likewise, the process of research funding was, for the most part, academically controlled. In the 1980s and 1990s, however, research alliances between universities and the private sector began to expand and have continued

²⁰¹ According to James MacAulay (1984: 75), the “failure to communicate” on the part of universities and businesses during this period was so problematic that consulting firms were enlisted to facilitate corporate-university research ties. In his words, the “fact that the consulting industry is moving into the field of university/industry liaison is a measure of the desperate situation that has been reached.”

to increase ever since.²⁰² Throughout this chapter, I review evidence that demonstrates the nature of this expansion and its impacts. The chapter begins with a discussion of how federal policy has influenced academic research in the Canadian context. Following that, I analyze the specific issues of intellectual property and commercialization in the university. The chapter concludes with a detailed analysis of how corporate influence has, in effect, corrupted academic research, from the selection of research topics, to research secrecy, through to how conflicts of interest and research bias influence the collection and release of information.

A History of Research Policy in Canada

The goal of this section is to review some of the key trends, programs and policy changes that have contributed to the corporatization of university research in Canada from the 1970s onward. While I include select provincial initiatives in this review, my analysis is largely concentrated at the national level in keeping with the fact that the federal government is the largest source of support for university research in Canada and has considerable influence over this aspect of post-secondary education.

As noted above, there was relatively little research collaboration between universities and industry in the 1970s. Nevertheless, there were some new organizations created during this time – many of them sponsored by Ottawa’s Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce – to facilitate corporate-university alliances. Some of these federal

²⁰² This shift has been an ongoing subject of academic debate (for an overview, see Rothaermel, Agung and Jiang 2007). Within this literature, some have described the changes as “revolutionary” (Zheng 2010); those who make this claim include “Triple Helix” (e.g., Etzkowitz and Dzisah 2008; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff 1998, 2000; Etzkowitz, Webster and Healy 1998) and “Mode 1/Mode 2” theorists (e.g., Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons 2001).

initiatives included Centres of Advanced Technology, Industrial Research Institutes, Industrial Innovation Centres, Management Advancement Institutes and Industrial Research Associations (MacAulay 1984). As well, between 1976 and 1981, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) provided \$1.2 billion in grants to encourage closer ties between universities and the private sector (Tudiver 1999).²⁰³ Provincial governments also established organizations to facilitate intersectoral cooperation. In Alberta, for example, the government created the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority to stimulate university-industry-government collaboration in the area of oil extraction and recovery. These three-way partnerships took other forms as well, including the formation of research parks, such as University Research Park in Calgary in 1967 and Innovation Place in Saskatoon in 1979.

In the 1980s, the federal Conservatives under Brian Mulroney oversaw a decisive shift in national research policy, which resulted in a real growth in research alliances between university and private sector partners. The basic objective of the new policy regime was to redirect university research towards industrial ends. As part of this “innovation” agenda, Canadian federal and provincial governments launched more than 100 intersectoral research partnerships to promote collaboration in science and technology (S&T) (Atkinson-Grosjean 2006). The mandate of the Science Council of Canada – the country’s national advisory agency on S&T policy – also changed. In one of the Council’s most influential reports, Philip Enros and Michael Farley (1986) coined the term “service university” to describe the desired relationship between universities and the

²⁰³ The NSERC Industrial Research Fellowship program was also created in 1980-81 to support the same mandate. Twenty-six awards were handed out that year; just two years later the number of grants increased to 132 (MacAulay 1984).

private sector. Put simply, “service” in this context referred to a narrow, unidirectional focus on satisfying corporate interests. Other federal initiatives helped to shape and define the university’s service role. In 1987, the government announced the creation of the Ministry of Industry, Science and Technology, which focused federal S&T activities in a single department and formally signalled the alignment of science with commerce. Private sector representatives were also incorporated into government policy-making bodies. One of the ways this occurred was through the establishment of federally appointed advisory committees concerned with university research, such as the Intellectual Property Advisory Committee and the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology (now the Advisory Council on Science and Technology).

At the same time, private sector agents become more involved in the activities of the federal granting councils: the NSERC, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and the Medical Research Council (MRC). Their influence was evident in the introduction of the SSHRC’s “strategic research grants” program, which was designed to entice researchers to pursue more applied and economically-driven projects. The NSERC in particular became a major player in the government’s drive to transform university research. Between 1981-82 and 1990-91, expenditures on NSERC’s basic research program declined from 72.7 percent to 61.9 percent of the council’s budget, while expenditures on targeted research rose from 11.6 to 18.5 percent. Over the same period, support for partnership research increased from \$1.9 to \$37 million, or by 1,900 percent (Polster 1998). The corporate orientation of all three councils was also strengthened in 1987 when the government launched its “matching funds” program. Strongly endorsed by the Corporate-Higher Education Forum, the program tied any

additional funding through the councils to matching contributions from the private sector (Cameron 1991).²⁰⁴

Another important development in the 1980s was the creation of the federal Networks of Centres of Excellence (NCE) program. Modeled on the Ontario network,²⁰⁵ federal NCEs were established as national research networks targeting commercial applications in partnership with industry. Janet Atkinson-Grosjean (2006), who conducted the seminal study on NCEs in Canada, describes the program this way:

Scientific excellence, commercial relevance, and public-private collaborations are recurrent themes in all new programs. Funding is targeted to areas of strategic importance to Canada's prosperity and international competitiveness ... The radical goal (later modified) was to turn university researchers *away* from basic science and *towards* commercial application. Further, the tradition of serendipitous discovery was far too anarchic for the policy establishment; research should not only be 'managed' – a novel concept – but managed on private sector rather than academic principles (pp. xiii-xv, emphasis in original).

From its inception, NCE research has been assessed on its ability to facilitate corporate-university partnerships and commercialization. In the first competition in 1988 (Phase I), each application had a 20 percent weight for showing that results would lead to commercial products or processes, and 20 percent for demonstrating linkages between universities, industry and government. The first 15 projects were funded in 1989-90 to the tune of \$240 million over five years. By 1992, NCE networks included 35 universities, 800 researchers, 1,300 graduate students and 173 corporations (Fisher et al. 2006). Shortly before leaving office, the Conservatives announced that existing networks

²⁰⁴ The province of Ontario introduced a number of matching programs in the 1980s as well, including the Board of Industrial Leadership and Development and the University Research Incentive Fund that matched grants for hundreds of corporate-sponsored university projects.

²⁰⁵ The Ontario Centres of Excellence program began in 1987. It was provided with \$200 million over five years to increase cooperative research between corporations and Ontario universities.

could compete for a second four-year funding phase (Phase II). In order to be renewed, NCEs had to demonstrate that they would strengthen their commercialization potential and relevance to industry. As a result, most Phase II networks conducted more applied and less basic research. In 2000, NCE participants had expanded to include 96 university organizations, 135 federal and provincial agencies and 567 corporations (Axelrod 2002). It is important to note that although NCEs have always been based in universities (and universities have assumed much of their costs), their structure has made them largely unaccountable to the policies that normally guide academic work.

With the election of the federal Liberals in 1993, the emphasis on “innovation” in university research became more entrenched. To affirm the use of scientific research to support the economy, the government reorganized Industry, Science and Technology Canada into a new department with an expanded portfolio, known simply as Industry Canada. The Liberals also made their innovation agenda explicit in several major reports. In 1999, for example, the Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research produced a report arguing that universities should add a fourth mission – “commercialization” – to their customary missions of teaching, research and service. The report also asserted that commercialization potential should be a condition for federal research funding and that professors’ commercialization track records should be incorporated into tenure and promotion policies. These prescriptions were not limited to engineering and the sciences but applied to all university disciplines, including the social sciences, fine arts and humanities. Interestingly, panel members did not include providing

universities with new revenue streams as one of their stated goals because they believed that commercialized research would offer only a small addition to university budgets.²⁰⁶

Three years later, the Liberals released two companion documents: *Achieving Excellence* (Industry Canada 2002) and *Knowledge Matters* (Human Resources Development Canada 2002). *Achieving Excellence* specifically addressed university research capacity at the national level. What is most striking about the report is that it assumes (like the Science Council in the 1980s) that the primary purpose of the university is to serve business. To this end, the government promised to “support academic institutions in identifying intellectual property with commercial potential and forging partnerships with the private sector to commercialize research results” (p. 50). These commitments were reflected in a \$50 million pilot project launched as part of the 2004 federal budget to strengthen the commercialization capacity of universities and research hospitals, as well as the growing corporate orientation of federal NCEs. Between 2002-03 and 2006-07, the number of private sector organizations involved in NCEs increased by 40 percent (AUCC 2008c). Summarizing the Liberal’s innovation agenda, David Cameron (2002: 164) writes: “In a word, the federal government has set its sights on transforming Canada’s universities into what Burton Clark has called the entrepreneurial university and what others have described as capitalizing knowledge or academic capitalism.” Somewhat surprisingly, the AUCC (2002a) not only supported this agenda, but it secretly negotiated an agreement with the government where, in exchange for

²⁰⁶ The resulting recommendations of the Panel were strongly opposed by many academics; in 2000, 1,400 prominent researchers (representing all academic disciplines) signed a letter rejecting the conclusions of the report.

increased funding, universities promised to *triple* their level of research commercialization.

Federal investments in university research rose from 733 million in 1997-98 to \$2.93 billion in 2007-08 (AUCC 2008c), and these investments were directed to support a particular policy agenda. A large proportion of the new money was provided through matching programs and other partnership arrangements. As a result, the number of corporate-academic research contracts sharply increased²⁰⁷ and university research investments by the private and not-for-profit sectors rose from \$910 million to \$1.7 billion during this period (AUCC 2008a).²⁰⁸ However, this figure does not include the large corporate investments in research infrastructure provided through the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI). As discussed in the last chapter, the CFI has channeled hundreds of millions of dollars in private sector funds to applied research fields (the natural sciences and engineering and health sciences received roughly 95 percent of CFI funding between 1998 and 2009). The organization's applied research focus is evident in its matching fund structure and the number of corporate representatives on its board; these individuals accounted for nearly 40 percent of all director and member positions

²⁰⁷ According to the AUCC (2008c), Canadian universities undertook 6,000 research contracts with Canadian and foreign firms in 2006, more than double the number in 1999.

²⁰⁸ In the preceding years, corporate funding for academic research had already advanced more rapidly in Canada compared with other G7 nations (Fisher et al. 2006). Universities also funded a larger and larger share of their own research expenses in the 1980s and 1990s. According to one estimate, the reliance of Canadian universities on their own private funds outpaced most other relevant nations between 1981 and 2003 (Vincent-Lancrin 2006). In part, this is explained by the growth in unfunded institutional costs associated with sponsored research. These costs grew by \$600 million between 1996-97 and 2006-07 alone (and they would have been higher if it were not for the introduction of the indirect-costs program in 2001 (AUCC 2008a).

between 1998 and 2009 (Guppy, Grabb and Mollica 2013).²⁰⁹ As of 2011, the CFI had provided 7,372 awards with a total value of more than \$4.4 billion (CAUT 2012a).

Targeted research investments under the Liberals also included the establishment of the Canada Research Chairs (CRC) program in 2002. This program provided \$900 million to establish and sustain 2,000 research chairs in Canadian universities. Like the CFI, the CRC program has been criticized for enhancing inequalities within and between universities (see Polster 2002; Siler and McLaughlin 2008). To date, the distribution of CRC chairs has heavily tilted in favour of some disciplines over others; natural sciences, health sciences and engineering have received 80 percent of all chairs, while the social sciences and humanities have been afforded just 20 percent. Moreover, because CRCs are awarded on the basis of each university's share of granting council funding, just 12 institutions received two thirds of all positions. CRCs have also increased inequality by violating principles of gender equity. In fact, the structure of the program disadvantages women on a number of fronts (e.g., it favours the natural sciences and engineering over other disciplines). In 2003, eight women launched a complaint with the Canadian Human Rights Commission over discrimination in chair allocation. The resulting settlement required the establishment of representation targets for disadvantaged groups (see Side and Robbins 2007).

The Liberal's innovation strategy also put significant pressure on the granting councils to forge closer ties with industry. Many NSERC programs were initiated or

²⁰⁹ As an independent foundation, the CFI also has its own governance structure and system for managing funds. It functions much like a corporation in that it "invests its money, diversifying the funds into money market accounts, mortgage-backed securities, and bonds ... This type of fund management necessitates a business-like orientation, and an atypical focus on the market when compared with traditional research councils" (Metcalf 2010: 506).

expanded to encourage such collaboration, including the Industrial Research Chairs program, Industrial R&D Fellowships program, “Innovation Platforms,” Strategic Grants program, New Faculty Support program and Undergraduate Student Research Awards. In 2004, the agency launched its “Innovation Challenge Award” to encourage students to identify market products or services that could be enhanced through the application of their research projects. Shortly thereafter, it introduced the “Ideas to Innovate” program to create spin-off companies from council funded projects. SSHRC’s acceptance (in 2000) of \$100 million for the “Initiative on the New Economy” is another example of how funding bodies altered their programs to make themselves more palatable to the Department of Finance and Industry Canada (who have a say in funding delivery).²¹⁰ Canada’s other major granting council, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), which replaced the MRC in 1999, launched its own “commercialization and innovation” strategy in 2005 to strengthen the value of research related intellectual property. As part of this initiative, the Science to Business program and the Commercialization Management Grants program were set up to educate health researchers in technology transfer and entrepreneurialism. It should be noted that the intellectual property capabilities of all three councils were strengthened in 2001 when they collectively launched the Intellectual Property Mobilization Program. This tri-council initiative was designed to accelerate commercialization and assist Canadian universities engaged in academic capitalism.

²¹⁰ Building on this initiative, in 2003 the SSHRC announced that it was transforming itself into a more “relevant” knowledge council. Written by university administrators, CRC recipients and private sector representatives, *From Granting Council to Knowledge Council* (2003) outlined the transformation of the SSHRC within the context of the federal government’s innovation agenda. The linkages between increased government funding and closer ties with industry are subtly referenced throughout the document.

During the Liberal's reign, provincial governments continued to develop funding mechanisms and agencies in line with the federal agenda. Examples include the BC Innovation Council (a provincial crown agency) and the New Brunswick Steering Committee on Post-secondary Research. In the Maritimes, Springboard Atlantic was established through federal and provincial initiative to provide resources to universities with a specific commercialization mandate. Likewise, the western provinces fund targeted university programs and services under the WestLink umbrella, which was formed to promote technology transfer in the areas of energy, internet technology, biotechnology and the physical sciences. The government of Quebec has also been involved in the promotion of public-private partnerships. Between 1994-95 and 2002-03, direct private funding for university research in Quebec increased by 61.3 percent. Over the same period, the proportion of *public* funding from federal and provincial sources earmarked for partnership or matching grants grew by 444 percent (Crespo and Dridi 2007). The Quebec government has also supported a corporate approach to innovation through programs such as Valorisation-Recherche Quebec (see Government of Quebec 2006).²¹¹

Perhaps more than any other province, the neoliberal policies of successive Ontario governments has advanced the corporatization agenda. For example, the Harris Conservatives created the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund (ORDCF) to divert public and private resources to applied/commercial projects in research-

²¹¹ It is important to emphasize, however, that Quebec's innovation agenda also maintains an explicit focus on "social innovation," or research that is designed to solve social and community problems. According to Fisher et al. (2009: 562-563), "[b]y referring to the concept of social innovation in this way, the Quebec government distanced itself from the strict technological innovation marketing promoted by the OECD and other governmental organizations."

intensive universities.²¹² They also provided a large amount of infrastructure funding through the Ontario Innovation Trust, whose structure and priorities closely resembled those of the SuperBuild program (discussed in the last chapter). In 2004, the provincial Liberals repackaged many of Harris' initiatives into the Ontario Research Fund in an effort to promote research of interest to industry. In subsequent years, Ontario's new Ministry of Research and Innovation²¹³ created the Market Readiness Program and the Ontario Research Commercialization Program to support this same goal. The Ministry has also played a key role in linking universities with business through its collaboration with the Ontario Centres of Excellence program and the Ontario Commercialization Network. As a result of these kinds of initiatives, corporate investments in Ontario university research increased by 64 percent between 2003 and 2008 (OCUFA 2009a).

Returning to the federal level, shortly after coming to power in 2006 the Harper Conservatives released their new S&T strategy in a document entitled *Mobilising Science and Technology to Canada's Advantage* (Government of Canada 2007a). The strategy includes a strong emphasis on commercialization and private sector involvement, which was put into practice in the 2007 budget when the government launched a new NCE program to be "proposed and led by the private sector." It also established a private sector advisory board "to ensure that new networks truly meet the needs of businesses" (Government of Canada 2007b: 205). Some of the new NCEs were packaged as Centres of Excellence for Commercialization and Research (CECR), which are designed to

²¹² In an apparent conflict of interest, the ORDCF (on more than one occasion) approved funding for research involving companies represented on its board (Robertson, McGrane and Shaker 2003).

²¹³ The Ontario Ministry of Research and Innovation, established in 2005, became part of the Ministry of Economic Development and Innovation in 2011. It then became its own ministry again in 2013. For a good illustration of the Ministry's corporate-centred approach to "innovation," see Government of Ontario (2008).

facilitate commercialization in the following “priority” areas: management, business and finance; natural resources and energy; health and life sciences; information and communications technologies; and the environment.²¹⁴

An interesting example of a CECR with an “environmental” focus is the Canada School of Energy and Environment, which is a tri-party collaboration between the universities of Calgary, Alberta and Lethbridge. The school supports tar sands development and advises industry and governments on creating “sound regulations and appropriate legislation” to deal with energy expansion and environmental enhancement (Stewart 2011). Although it purports to be an academic research centre, the school’s executive director – Bruce Carson – is a political appointee and long-time strategist for the Harper Government. Before assuming his position, Carson served as vice chair of the Energy Policy Institute of Canada, whose membership includes numerous representatives from the oil and gas industries. Keith Stewart of Greenpeace Canada describes Carson as “the political quarterback for the joint government/industry pro-tar sands campaign” (cited in Stewart 2011). The Harper government’s support for research that caters to the interests of Big Oil is well recognized. A survey of “senior people considered to be well informed on S&T in Canada” found widespread agreement that Canada’s two strongest areas (out of 50) of research and technology application are “Oilsands and Related” and “Conventional Oil & Gas Exploration/Extraction” (Council of Canadian Academies

²¹⁴ Not surprisingly, a study by Ekos (2009: 36) found that the “challenges of marrying the research/academic culture with the business objectives of the CECRs” has not been an easy transition for academic researchers. Applicants for the 2015 CECR competition are expected to present a business plan that charts the new centre’s path to becoming self-sustaining. “Sustainability” in this context means that centres must continue their core activities beyond CECR funding by establishing independent business models and corporate partnerships.

2006: 3, 6). Notably, survey respondents also identified “Clean Energy Technologies” as the area where Canada *should* be developing its future S&T capacity.

In keeping with its S&T strategy, the Harper government also recently pledged \$200 million over seven years – though the Canada Excellence Research Chairs program – to encourage 19 internationally recognized researchers to pursue their work in Canada.²¹⁵ Similar to the CERCs, these chairs are targeted in the areas of information and communication technologies, natural resources and energy, health sciences and the environment. This narrow focus not only excludes most researchers in the natural sciences, but it effectively excludes more than half of Canada’s researchers in the social sciences and humanities. It has also excluded women; all 19 current chair holders are men and not a single woman has been nominated for an award.

To implement their innovation agenda, the federal granting councils have been one of the Harper government’s most consistent targets. At NSERC, for example, the Collaborative Research and Development Grants program and the expanded Industrial Research Chairs program have linked hundreds of major corporations with university researchers. The University of Alberta alone currently holds 22 Industrial Research Chairs, which is double the number of any other university (Crawshaw 2013). As part of NSERC’s “Strategy for Partnership and Innovation,” the government has also redirected public funds to the Engage Grants program (which grew from \$2 to \$18 million between 2009-10 and 2011-12) and the Interaction Grants program. Part of the mandate of both programs is to help solve company-specific problems, which is tantamount to providing

²¹⁵ In 2010, federal Industry Minister Tony Clement also announced an additional \$275.6 million to create 310 new/renewed “regular” CRCs at 53 universities. Infrastructure and equipment for the CRCs are supported by additional government investments in the CFI as well money from the 2009 Knowledge Infrastructure Program.

free labour for the corporate sector. According to Karen Seidman (2013b), since 2009 “company specific research funding” has grown by more than 1,000 percent.

Remarkably, in 2012, NSERC was even offering to organize “speed dating” events to bring interested researchers and companies together. At the same time, NSERC’s Discovery Grants program – the main funding source for basic research in the natural sciences and engineering – has declined significantly. In 1978, the program accounted for two thirds of the council’s budget; by 2010, it had fallen to one third. Between 2002 and 2010, the success rate for Discovery Grant applicants also fell from 83 to 58 percent (CAUT 2010d). Since 2010, the program has been cut by an additional 14.5 million.

Predictably, the CIHR’s commercial mandate has also expanded in recent years. For example, the Conservatives enlarged the CIHR Proof of Principle program and the CIHR/Rx&D Collaborative Research program, both of which are designed to support health researchers to move their discoveries from the academy to the marketplace. In 2009, controversy arose when Dr. Bernard Prigent, vice-president of medical affairs at Pfizer Canada, was appointed to the CIHR’s governing council. Given that Pfizer has every interest in diverting CIHR funds toward commercial drug studies and away from research that might challenge the pharmaceutical therapeutic paradigm, this appointment represented an obvious conflict of interest. This is in addition to Pfizer’s history of transgressions against scientific integrity and its extensive criminal background. Steven Lewis, Saskatchewan health researcher and former member of the CIHR council, states: “It is hardly irrelevant that the company to which Dr. Prigent owes his livelihood and his allegiance has owned up to sleaze that stands out even among its shady peers” (cited in Munro 2009). Of course, many non-academic appointees sit on the governing boards of

the granting agencies. For instance, half of the NSERC's council members in 2010 (many of whom are not scientists) were from the private sector. One of these appointments was climate change skeptic and former head of the Fraser Institute, Mark Mullins (Tamburri 2010). At the SSHRC, nine of its 19 governing council members were from corporations or non-profit agencies in 2010, compared with just four in 2000. This enhanced corporate presence aligns with the government's announcement in 2007 of an additional \$11 million earmarked for SSHRC research in management, business and finance; and its 2009 announcement that scholarships granted by the SSHRC would focus on "business-related degrees." These new provisions conflict with the basic mandate of the granting councils, which is to rely on peer review and accord scholarships on the basis of merit, not on the basis of field of study.

Recent federal budgets have continued to neglect basic research in favour of applied programs. In Budget 2012, \$37 million was allocated to enhance council support for "industry-academic research partnership initiatives" in areas with promising commercial output. In Budget 2013, \$12 million was earmarked for the College and Community Innovation program at NSERC – a collaborative venture between community colleges and corporations focusing on specific company needs – while \$15 million went to support CIHR's "Patent-Oriented Research Strategy" (CAUT 2013c). The Harper government has also overseen a transformation of its in-house research branch, the National Research Council (NRC). The current president of the Council, John McDougall, is a former Esso petroleum engineer and has never published a scientific paper. In 2013, the government formally announced that the NRC was "open for business" and would receive \$121 million over two years to shift into its industry-

oriented mandate (Allen 2013). Many university-based scientists work closely with NRC researchers and rely on the Council's facilities, which mean that these collaborations may now be in jeopardy.

It is worth noting that this growing entanglement of corporations in university research, facilitated by successive federal policy agendas, may be especially problematic in the Canadian context for the following reasons: (i) the weakness of private sector research and development (R&D); (ii) the relatively high level of R&D performed by universities, and (iii) the relatively high level of corporate R&D investment in universities. It is well known that Canada's private sector performs and funds a smaller share of R&D activities compared with other industrialized nations.²¹⁶ In contrast, Canadian universities performed an estimated 36 percent of Canada's R&D activities in 2007, which was much larger than the US (14 percent) and the OECD average (17 percent).²¹⁷ Also in 2007, Canada's private sector invested a higher proportion of its R&D expenditures in universities than was the case in all other G7 nations and all but three OECD countries. Furthermore, this level of investment appears to be accelerating. Between 2001 and 2007, private sector investments in university research increased by 28 percent. In contrast, business investments in its own research activities grew by just 3.5 percent (AUCC 2008c).

²¹⁶ In 2006, for example, Canada's private sector performed just 54 percent of Canadian R&D (valued at \$15.8 billion), compared with 70 percent in the US and 69 percent across all OECD countries. Of this 15.8 billion, just \$600 million (or 4 percent) was allocated to basic research (AUCC 2008c). Business funding for R&D in Canada is also well below the OECD average. In 2007, these figures were 48 and 63 percent respectively.

²¹⁷ Between 1998 and 2008, growth in higher education R&D performance was responsible for more than half of the total growth of R&D in Canada (Government of Canada 2011). Canada's growing reliance on universities for R&D is also reflected in its high ranking on post-secondary research expenditures as a percentage of GDP. In 2006, Canada placed second only to Sweden among OECD nations on this measure (CCL 2009c).

Government efforts to corporatize university research have been opposed by many within the academic community. In 2005, for example, 40 prominent Canadian scientists spoke out publicly against the kinds of co-funding or matching programs favoured by governments and the negative implications of corporate funding for university research (Tyers et al. 2005).²¹⁸ Although their concerns have been largely ignored by political elites, the public believes they should be taken seriously. According to a nation-wide poll, 44 percent of Canadians said they find the opinions of university scientists to be the most trustworthy in the debate over university research funding in Canada. Further, 18 percent of respondents endorsed students as the most trustworthy source; 10 percent said corporations, nine percent said university administrators; and just nine percent said the federal government (CAUT 2009b).

In line with these policy changes, universities in Canada have become accustomed to operating in a more competitive funding environment and more adept at casting their activities in terms of the requirements set forth by funding agencies. As a result, many university administrations have adopted the same kind of “innovation” agenda as neoliberal governments, with the same restrictive focus on commercialization and intellectual property. The next section explores how university administrations (and some segments of academia) are actively supporting the corporatization of academic research.

²¹⁸ The comments of these scientists are worth quoting at length: “Inevitably, co-funding steers resource allocation, as dictated by the partner entity, which may be to the detriment of some of the best science. In particular, co-funding is often biased against fundamental research that is far from commercialization and so at odds with the short-term goals of industrial partners ... In general, grants are best awarded solely on the basis of scientific peer review, and funded in full without matches, strings, or contingencies that depend on outside agents. By eschewing scientific excellence as the primary consideration, co-funded programs imperil scientific credibility and fail to engage the breadth and depth of national scientific expertise” (Tyers et al. 2005: 1867).

Intellectual Property and Commercialization in Canadian Universities

For much of the twentieth century, academics (and universities) did not consider research-related intellectual property (IP) as an opportunity for economic enrichment. Many university inventors who were formally entitled to patent royalties did their best to avoid personal remuneration, preferring to channel the obligatory profits back into their laboratories. Others resisted patenting altogether. For instance, when Jonas Salk discovered the polio vaccine in 1954 (an invention clearly worth millions), he did not patent the vaccine because he believed that no individual should own or profit from discoveries made about the natural world. Similarly, Stanley Cohen and Herbert Boyer, who discovered the gene-splicing technique in 1973, resisted patenting because they recognized that their discovery depended upon the freely available work of other scientists. In short, the prevailing academic view was that knowledge should be placed in the public domain without proprietary restrictions, and that limiting access by commercializing research results was a suspect practice, or worse.²¹⁹

Under corporatization, these ideas about the role of IP in higher education have largely been abandoned. The result has been a plethora of new IP agreements designed to convert knowledge into profit. Proponents claim that IP rights serve a number of economic and social functions in that they: (i) increase corporate profits and generate new revenue streams for universities; (ii) provide incentives for academics to create useful products and services; and (iii) encourage professors to move nascent discoveries out of the ivory tower and into the marketplace.

²¹⁹ Moreover, many of the arguments *for* university patents in the early twentieth century were focused on protecting the public from the scourge of unregulated private enterprise (Metlay 2006). This included the actions of corporate “patent pirates,” who peddled substandard goods and charged exorbitant prices by patenting academic discoveries.

Contrary to these views, I would argue that the negative consequences of the commercialization agenda in Canadian universities outweigh any perceived benefits. First, under this mandate, basic research is typically viewed as mere curiosity or indulgence. Researchers in fields like the humanities and social sciences and speculative science – which lack the profit-making or power enhancing applications of other disciplines – have been deemed less relevant in the eyes of administrators, social leaders and the public. According to Thomas D’Aquino, former head of the Canadian Council of Chief Executives, “research on its own, without the benefit of transformation into new products, processes, and services, is of little value” (cited in D’Aquino and Stewart-Patterson 2001: 17). Second, a commercial orientation creates a preoccupation with outcomes by attaching monetary incentives to discovery, which can lead to research bias. It also enhances research secrecy and stifles scientific progress by restricting the free flow of information (these issues are discussed in greater detail later in the chapter). Related to this, IP does not provide incentives to engage in research (create/discover); rather, it merely generates incentives for academics to commercialize their discoveries (or “innovate”). Third, not only have the financial returns on IP for universities been marginal at best, but the costs to the public have been substantial. Although the Canadian taxpayer pays most of the costs of university research, they do not incur benefits at the same rate as research products increasingly become the property of corporations, universities or professors. Moreover, as Benjamin Ginsberg (2011: 189) describes it, IP incentives and reward structures have “institutionalized scientific avarice,” thereby eroding the ability and willingness of academics to respond to a broad range of public needs and interests. This is not to suggest that all IP rights are counter-productive in the

academy. For example, IP ownership can enhance control over creativity and contribute to academic freedom. Indeed, protecting certain ownership rights, such as course-related IP and other scholarly products covered by copyright, is particularly important in the current context to protect the legitimate interests of the professoriate. Under corporatization, however, the concept of intellectual property has been transformed from a mechanism of academic protection to a commercial obsession on the part of administrators, academic capitalists and members of the private sector.

Creating the Commercial Infrastructure

Much can be learned about the commercial orientation of university administrators from academic planning documents. For example, Guelph's (2008: 2) "strategic research plan" states that the university "is expected to figure prominently in the proposed national expansion of the commercialization of university research." Therefore, while the university will try to remain "respectful" of fundamental, discipline-based research, commercial engagement and private sector collaboration are the overriding priorities. Similarly, a planning document from Brock (2009: 5) reads: "Without losing sight of the importance of basic and inquiry-based research ... Brock University's faculty and student researchers will be particularly interested in the impact of their work upon the economic, social and cultural development of the Niagara Region." To fulfill this objective, the university will "support expanded commercialization opportunities through the development of appropriate intellectual property arrangements." Lakehead (2009) has a similar mandate and its administration explicitly recognizes that a key impediment to commercialization is the traditional faculty research culture. To remedy these outdated ideas, it asserts that "faculty must be provided with additional education relating to the

value of technology transfer to the University, particularly what technology transfer means, how it benefits research” and how the administration can assist professors in commercializing their discoveries (p. 24).

To fulfill these commercial objectives and better align with the corporatization agenda, university administrators have been active in creating a commercial research infrastructure. Over the past few decades, most administrations in Canada have expanded their offices of research administration, diverted resources to disciplines with greater economic potential, and developed formal and informal IP policies that encourage academics to commercialize. Often in collaboration with governments and the private sector, administrators have also been key players in the establishment of two other instruments of commercialization: (i) technology transfer offices, and (ii) university-industry research centres.

Technology transfer offices (TTOs), sometimes referred to as industrial liaison or business development offices, play a central role in IP management and the commercialization agenda of Canadian universities. The function of TTOs is to translate the results of university research into concrete commercial applications. Professional staff members in these offices assist faculty in commercializing their inventions and are sometimes involved in other forms of university-industry liaison, such as industry-sponsored contract research. In Canada, TTOs did not appear in their current form until the 1980s. Their rate of expansion has been rapid; by 1995, 32 universities had established an office (Fisher and Atkinson-Grosjean 2002). Between 1999 and 2008, the proportion of Canadian universities actively managing IP through TTOs increased from

61 to 88 percent (AUCC 2008c; Statistics Canada 2010). Today, all but the smallest Canadian institutions have active TTOs. Their size, tasks and organization vary considerably²²⁰ and the number of technology transfer personnel ranges from one person to up to 30 on some campuses. Many of these officers work closely with industrial technology advisors from the NRC's Industrial Research Assistance Program (IRAP) and are assisted in their professional development by the Intellectual Property Mobilization Program.²²¹

A significant proportion of the work performed by TTOs is generated by university-industry research centres. These centres include a diverse collection of research associations, including research parks, research clusters and business incubators, which all represent some form of institutionalized collaboration between the academy and industry. For example, the University of Windsor/Chrysler Canada Automotive Research and Development Centre is a cooperative R&D facility where students, professors and corporate engineers work together on automotive research initiatives. One of Canada's newest business incubators is Digital Media Zone (DMZ), which opened at Ryerson University in 2010. Like other incubators, DMZ's facilities are designed to encourage public-private partnerships and spin-off companies, which are corporations formed in order to commercially exploit academic inventions. According to Sheldon Levy (2011),

²²⁰ At some universities, the TTO is located on campus and fully integrated into the university's structure (e.g., Simon Fraser). At others, the TTO operates outside the institution, either as a non-profit corporation (e.g., Queen's) or for-profit corporation (e.g., Victoria). In either case, the corporation is wholly owned by the university.

²²¹ It is interesting to note that although technology transfer officers in Canada are key facilitators of the corporatization process, many of them have a "surprisingly idealistic perspective" on the role of the university as an institution of general knowledge creation and public service. In contrast, these same offices assert that governments and funding agencies view university research primarily in economic terms (Bubela and Caulfield 2010).

president at Ryerson, DMZ helped spawn 34 spin-off companies in its first 19 months of operation.

Research parks located on or near university campuses have also become an important instigator of university-industry collaboration. Examples include Edmonton Research Park in Alberta, Innovation Place in Saskatchewan (one of the largest research parks in North America) and the University of Manitoba's "smarkpark." Smartpark Development Corporation is a subsidiary corporation of the University of Manitoba with a mandate to develop land and lease space to companies who work in areas that coincide with research expertise at the university. Today, the university's Smartpark Research and Technology Park is home to 30 corporations, most notably Monsanto, and employs 1,100 people in nine buildings across the park. A survey conducted by the Canadian Association of University Research Parks claimed that the 25 research parks located in Canada in 2007 were home to more than 750 high technology corporations and research centres and employed over 39,000 people (AUCC 2008c).

In addition to TTOs, business incubators and research parks, a growing number of research "clusters" have emerged in Canada as part of the new commercial infrastructure. In these clusters, business, financial and academic institutions come together in a single geographic location. Located in Toronto's downtown "Discovery District," MaRS exemplifies the cluster concept at an advanced stage of development. MaRS is a convergence innovation centre that sits at the epicentre of one of North America's most concentrated clusters of biomedical research and expertise. It actively networks corporations with academic and medical researchers to enhance the commercialization of IP. Other prominent research clusters in Canada include Montreal's digital media and

computer graphics cluster; Saskatoon's agriculture biotechnology cluster; and Waterloo's information technology cluster that is renowned for churning out profitable spin-off companies.

Public Subsidy, Private Profit: Changes to IP Ownership Rights

A brief note on changes to IP ownership rights in the US and Canada is included here as a way to contextualize the commercialization agenda in higher education. Prior to 1980, US universities were able to secure patents on publicly-funded research only through special government approval, which typically followed a lengthy application process. As a result, only a small number of universities engaged in patenting activities. In 1980, the Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act, more commonly known as the Bayh-Dole Act was passed. This legislation enabled universities to own and license patents on discoveries made through publicly-funded research, and was the product of intensive lobbying by universities, corporations and the Business Higher Education Forum. The goals of this lobbying network were to further subsidize corporate R&D through university research and make universities more amenable to serving corporate interests. In Canada, a similar change occurred in 1990 by Treasury Board fiat. In previous years, all IP produced under government contract was vested in the Crown. From this point forward, patents that had reverted to the Crown became property of the university. So, like their US counterparts, universities across Canada had the capacity to grant patent licenses to industrial partners in return for corporate patronage.

Needless to say, changes that allowed universities to claim IP rights on technologies developed in their laboratories greatly accelerated academic capitalism. As potential patent holders, administrators viewed more and more academic research as potential IP,

while faculty were better able to conceptualize and advance their discoveries as commercial products. These changes also facilitated a massive give-away of public assets to private industry. As Leonard Minsky (2000: 98) writes in the case of Bayh-Dole:

No longer acting as agents of the taxpayers who had paid for the invention, the universities were simply given ownership by the legislation. They, in turn, pass the invention on to the corporations for a price, a price that never reflects the true cost of the development of the invention, already paid for up-front by the public. This slight-of-hand dimension of 'technology transfer,' whereby public assets are basically handed over to transnational corporations for pennies on the dollar, remains invisible to the public ... The act was a gift of public money to private investors using the universities to launder the money.

In short, these IP arrangements give corporations the rights (often exclusive monopoly rights) to inventions generated at public expense. This process typically requires the public to pay twice for the same invention; they pay once through taxes to support the research and again through restricted supply and higher prices when the invention reaches the market. Because universities do not work patents or manufacture anything, this means they have become, in effect, patent holding companies.

Despite similar policy shifts in the two countries, the absence of a national legislative framework (like Bayh-Dole) means that IP policies at Canadian universities vary considerably. Each university in Canada is free to develop its own policies, which are translated into practice by TTOs. At some universities, the IP belongs to the inventor; at others, the IP is owned by the university. Many other institutions have joint arrangements where IP ownership and the distribution of revenues are shared according to some prescribed formula. Most universities in Canada have tended to take the position that they should receive some IP revenue in exchange for providing researchers with facilities and resources.

Commercialization: Interpreting the Data

Most of the empirical work, by government agencies and organizations like the Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM) alike, use three key indicators to track the commercialization of university research: patents (and invention disclosures), licensing agreements (and royalties) and spin-off companies. While these indicators do not represent the full spectrum of technology transfer and are limited (e.g., Bubela and Caulfield 2010; Langford et al. 2006), they are useful for documenting the commercial output of universities and account for much of the work performed by TTOs. Together, they make clear that the commercialization of university research has increased sharply since the early 1990s. Between 1991 and 1997, for example, professional staffing for IP management doubled; the number of active patents and technologies tripled; and income from commercialization grew fourfold (Fisher and Atkinson-Grosjean 2002). In 1991, 10 Canadian universities participating in the AUTM survey reported an average of 4.9 licenses/options executed; by 2001, there were 22 participating institutions reporting an average of 14.2. Over the same period, the average number of invention disclosures rose from 25 to 43.5 (Kachur 2003). The rate of growth of university spin-off companies is equally noteworthy. According to Statistics Canada (2010), of the nearly 700 spin-off firms created in universities and their affiliated research hospitals between 1980 and 1999, 78 percent were formed in the 1990s. This represented an average rate of 54 companies per year, versus less than 16 per year in the 1980s (see Table 8.1).

Table 8.1
Year of Incorporation of Spin-Off Companies

Spin-Off Companies		
Years	Number*	Percent
Before 1980	45	3.7
1980 to 1984	64	5.2
1985 to 1989	92	7.5
1990 to 1994	181	14.8
1995 to 1999	359	29.4
2000 to 2004	312	25.5
2005 to 2007	123	10.1
Not Stated	47	3.8
Total	1223	100.0

Source: Statistics Canada 2010d. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector, 2008*.

**Note: These estimates represent an inventory of all spin-off companies reported by educational institutions since 1999, regardless of the status of those institutions (active, inactive, merged or amalgamated).*

As shown in Table 8.2, the commercialization of academic research continued in the 2000s. In 2008, researchers in Canadian universities and research hospitals reported 1,613 invention disclosures, an increase of 81 percent over 1999.²²² Also in 2008, these institutions filed 1,791 patent applications (173 percent more than the 1999 total) and the number of accumulated patents held by universities grew from 1,915 to 5,908.²²³ Looking at licensing activity, universities and hospitals awarded 524 new licenses/options in 2008, a 126 percent increase over 1999. As well, the total number of active licenses/options

²²² According to data from 37 universities across Canada, more than one third of invention disclosures in 2008 were in agricultural or medical life science fields (Council of Canadian Academies 2012b).

²²³ Between 2000 and 2004, the proportion of Canadian patents owned by universities was 5.8 percent, which was well above the OECD average (4.3 percent) and the EU average (3.1 percent) (CCL 2009c).

grew from 1,165 to 3,343, or by 187 percent. Table 8.2 also shows that the number of full-time equivalent employees engaged in IP management in academic institutions increased from 178 in 1999 to 321 in 2008 (an 80 percent increase). The rate of university spin-off formation also remained strong in the 2000s, with an average of 54 companies being created each year between 2001 and 2007 (Table 8.1). It should be noted that the data from Statistics Canada actually underestimates the number of university-based spin-offs because it only includes companies that are started in a formal

Table 8.2
Intellectual Property in Canada's Higher Education Sector

	1999	2008	Increase
Invention Disclosures	893	1,613	+81%
New Patent Applications	656	1,791	+173%
Patents Held	1,915	5,908	+209%
New Licences and Options	232	524	+126%
Active Licenses and Options	1,165	3,343	+187%
Full-time equivalent employees engaged in IP management	178	321	+80%

Sources: Statistics Canada. 2010d. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 2008*; Statistics Canada. 2000. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 1999*.

arrangement with the university. In other words, the numbers would be significantly higher if spin-offs created by university faculty on an independent basis were taken into account. Some researchers claim that Canadian universities create twice as many spin-off

companies as US universities per dollar of research expenditure (e.g., Robin 2004; Van Loon 2005).²²⁴

Based on these data, one might conclude that Canadian universities have been largely successful in achieving their commercialization mandate. To be sure, some specific institutions have. While large institutions like the University of Toronto lead the country in aggregate measures of commercialization (University of Toronto 2009), the University of Waterloo is Canada's most successful entrepreneurial university relative to its size. The depth and breadth of corporate-university research ties at Waterloo are illustrated by the relatively large amount of private funding it attracts and its cooperative education programs, where students complete work terms in industry as part of their curriculum. During a 2005 speaking tour, Bill Gates noted that in most years Microsoft hires "more students out of Waterloo than any other university in the world" (cited in Bramwell and Wolfe 2008). Waterloo has also shown a special aptitude for acquiring patents and generating spin-offs. This does not simply involve a few big companies (like Research in Motion); the entire Waterloo high technology cluster is effectively an offshoot of the university. Many have credited Waterloo's commercial success to its entrepreneurial culture and its IP ownership model, which allows individual faculty (and students) to commercialize their ideas and retain full ownership rights.

Looking at the country as a whole, however, the financial benefits of commercialization have been limited at best. Even though Canadian universities have

²²⁴ Another study of NSERC grant holders found that 16.8 percent of these researchers attempted to create spin-off firms from their research (and double that proportion had used this or another mechanism to protect their intellectual property). These figures led the authors to conclude that "the reality of research commercialization is more extensive in Canadian universities than commonly assumed" (Landry, Amara and Rherrad 2006: 1611). University spin-off formation has been significantly enhanced by assistance from the federal government: approximately one quarter of IRAP's industrial technology advisors are located on university campuses and roughly half of university spin-offs have received IRAP funds (AUCC 2008c).

been adept at generating spin-off companies, these firms are much more likely to fail compared with US firms, and their patents and licenses generate far less revenue. According to Karen Mazurkewich (2011), who co-directed a report on intellectual property for the Canadian International Council, between 2002 and 2008 revenue from IP created at Canadian universities “was 1.14 percent of the total R&D expenditures, compared to five percent at U.S. schools ... While Canadian scientists are great at collaborating on publications, or sharing basic research data, our entrepreneurs are terrible at teaming up for the critical commercialization phase of business – helping carry an invention to market.” As shown in Table 8.3, between 2004 and 2008 university revenues from IP were relatively small, at roughly \$54 million per year. In 2004, the \$51 million in income represented only 0.25 percent of total university revenues that year (Van Loon 2005). When the operational expenditures for IP management are factored in, this additional revenue is pared down to virtually nothing. And in 2008, the \$53 million generated from IP paled in comparison with the nearly \$2 billion in contract research undertaken by Canadian universities and hospitals (Statistics Canada 2010d). Table 8.3 also suggests that increases in IP expenditures are outpacing the income generated from these activities. Qualitative data from technology transfer officers confirms that most universities in Canada generate little valuable IP and almost no revenue from commercialization. As one officer explained, “there are very few universities that actually make money off their patent portfolios” (Bubela and Caulfield 2010: 449).²²⁵

²²⁵ Furthermore, many government policies and programs do not appear to be helping. For example, of 500 publicly funded research projects reviewed by the Centres of Excellence for Commercialization and Research (CECR) network over the last 10 years, only 80 were identified as having commercial viability and, of this group, only 40 moved forward: “This means that 460 commercially-driven research programs, funded with public funds, failed to produce commercially viable results” (CFS 2012: 16).

Just as the Expert Panel on the Commercialization of University Research recognized back in 1999, commercialization has yet to be proven as a viable way to augment Canadian university budgets.

Table 8.3
IP Expenditures and Revenues

	1999	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Total operational expenditures for IP management (\$ thousands)	22,018	36,927	41,544	42,492	41,851	51,124
Total Income from IP (\$ thousands)	24,770	51,210	55,173	59,689	52,477	53,183

Sources: Statistics Canada. 2010d. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 2008*; Statistics Canada. 2000. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 1999*.

Of course, it should be pointed out that Canadian universities are not alone in this regard. Sixty percent of US universities and half of British universities do not earn enough from their licensing activities to cover the costs of their TTOs (Bubela and Caulfield 2010). As Slaughter and Rhoades (2008: 23) have argued, universities are “not particularly effective as venture capitalists, investment bankers, or investors in the (stock) market” and they tend to converge upon similar market opportunities rather than niche comparative advantages. They also claim that a very small number of universities around the world benefit from most of the patenting and technology transfer that takes place in higher education. For the rest, these activities result in little additional revenue and, in many cases, financial losses. Typical of market inefficiencies in the broader economy, market failure in higher education is underwritten by the public in the form of higher

tuition and other subsidies. Clearly, the financial problems of Canadian universities will not be solved (or even mitigated) by the commercialization of research. However, the lack of financial benefits is of small significance when compared with other outcomes associated with this aspect of corporatization. The third section of this chapter explores how corporate involvement in university research has corrupted academic scholarship, jeopardized the integrity of the public university and threatened the public interest.

The Corporate Corruption of Academic Research

Supporters of corporatization present the benefits of university-industry research ties in clear, decisive terms. These purported benefits include financial support for universities, commercially valuable product development, faculty access to R&D opportunities, enhanced technological innovation and scientific progress. Some even claim that industry funding and public-private partnerships enhance customary measures of academic quality, such as publication productivity (Crespo and Dridi 2007). As the Corporate-Higher Education Forum put it 30 years ago, these partnerships generate “an economy of research effort and a synergy of results that generates genuine payoffs to the partners and to Canadian society as a whole” (Maxwell and Currie 1984: 83). Given the integrity of academic science and the safeguards of the peer review process, proponents also argue that concerns about academic freedom, research secrecy or conflicts of interest are largely unfounded. And, even if the process does result in reduced knowledge sharing or unethical research practices in some instances, the benefits are presented as overshadowing the costs. For its advocates, then, “the new ethos of academic commercialism, operating at all levels of research institutions, is largely viewed as a

proper, favorable tradeoff of values, where conflicts of interest are manageable and impossible to eliminate and where the basic integrity of the university can be protected” (Krimsky 2003: 3).

In contrast, I would argue that the corporatization of academic research has not been beneficial for universities or for society, and that the negative impacts of corporate involvement far outweigh the benefits. Moreover, corporatization has corrupted the basic values that have historically defined scientific and other academic research, and compromised the ability of the university to act as a site of disinterested inquiry and independent thought. As David Noble (2001: 38) describes it, these changes have “ushered in a brash new regime of proprietary control, secrecy, fraud, theft, and commercial motives and preoccupations.” In large measure, the corrupting influence of corporate power stems from the fundamental antagonism between corporate and academic institutions and their opposing research cultures. This section explores how university research has been transformed – and the public interest threatened – by the corporatization process.

Selection of Research Topics

Corporate influence crosses all aspects of the academic research process, including at the outset with the selection of research topics and projects. Rather than setting their own research agendas in response to social needs, academics are increasingly joining with partners from the private sector to define their research priorities. As a result, the basis for deciding what knowledge is worth pursuing is defined more and more by the criteria of corporate demand. Many areas of university research have been affected by this shift. In agricultural research, for example, the influence of ag-chemical companies has moved

research agendas in the direction of resource intensive production technologies, genetic engineering and chemical-based pest and weed control. In the latter case, hundreds of millions of dollars are being allocated to the development of new toxic pesticides in university labs, while the study of biological control – the discipline of controlling agriculture pests through means other than pesticides – has all but disappeared. Likewise, because of their dependence on industry funding, the research of most weed scientists centres on chemical herbicides rather than alternative forms of management like biological control and crop rotation strategies.²²⁶ According to John McMurtry (2009: 17), independent agricultural research in areas such as “integrated pest management, organic farming for productive efficiency, management-intensive grazing, small-scale producer cooperatives, alternatives to factory-processed livestock and avoidance of ecological contamination by genetically-engineered commodities” have been “silently selected out” of universities because corporations are not interested in funding them.

The same is true in many areas of health research. In recent years, far more resources have been put into investigating the cellular/genetic basis for cancer than into environmental factors, which are now widely recognized to be key determining factors. Not only are corporations unwilling to fund research into the linkages between cancers and industrial toxins, they have also made a concerted effort to suppress academic research that demonstrates any kind of causal relationship. In the same way, corporate and government funding programs have worked to redirect cancer research from causes to cures (Thompson 2008). It is often claimed that without the money and support of

²²⁶ Nearly two decades ago in *Toxic Deception*, Dan Fagan and Marianne Lavell (1996: 52) quoted the former president of the Weed Science Society of American as stating: “If you don't have any research [funding] other than what's coming from the ag chemical companies, you're going to be doing research on agricultural chemicals. That's the hard, cold, fact.”

large corporations, universities would lack the capacity (and the incentive) to produce new life-saving drugs, medicines and therapies. The reality, however, is quite different. Corporate influence has diverted academic attention away from vaccine research and diseases that affect the world's poor (e.g., malaria, schistosomiasis, tuberculosis and dengue fever). In fact, a recent study of the top 54 Canadian and US research universities found that less than 3 percent of research funding is devoted to diseases that affect the world's poorest people (Universities Allied for Essential Medicines 2013). The report also notes that more than a billion people currently suffer from "neglected diseases," or diseases that are "rarely researched by the private sector because most of those affected are too poor to provide a market for new drugs" (10 million people die each year because they cannot access life-saving medicines that already exist). For commercial reasons, the vast majority of research investments by the pharmaceutical industry (and increasingly universities) focus on what are called "lifestyle drugs" – high-profit treatments for obesity, baldness, wrinkles and sexual dysfunction. Of course, the impact of corporatization on academic research agendas is not limited to the sciences. In her work, Lauren Snider (2000, 2003) has documented a precipitous decline in social science research on corporate crime in Canada and elsewhere. She attributes this decline to the unwillingness of private sponsors and governments to fund this type of research, and to political pressures both inside and outside of the academy.

In some ways, academics may be viewed as victims in this process. University researchers are under intense pressure to secure outside funding and many would be unable to continue their research programs without such support. A recent survey by researchers at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, for example, found that three

quarters of Canadian academics said that pressures to raise external funds had increased since their first appointment (Tamburri 2012). Furthermore, the distinction between research choices made out of scholarly interest and those made because of funding availability is not an easy one to draw. Many academics believe they are engaging with particular topics out of their own free choice when in reality they are “adjusting their curiosities” to match the interests of available sponsors. According to Jeff Schmidt (2000), many funders are aware that they can arouse the necessary interest in academic circles without formally dictating research priorities. On the other hand, academics are also active participants in the selection of their areas of research. The fact that so many of them acquiesce to (or embrace) corporate lines of research suggests a high level of conscious complicity. According to Polster (2000: 30), many Canadian scholars freely admit to doing “whatever it takes” to strengthen their granting performance, including “switching their research topics to well-funded areas in which they often have lesser expertise.” In sum, although corporate-university ties may reduce the ability of some academics to engage in alternative or critical research agendas, the selection of research topics are moral and political *choices* that cannot simply be blamed on financial necessity or the demands of funders.

Research Secrecy

Universities have traditionally been an important source of the knowledge commons, which Jennifer Sumner (2008a: 193) defines as “cooperative human constructions that protect and/or enable universal access to the life good of knowledge ... This knowledge is shared, not privatized, packaged, priced, and profited from.” Similarly, David Bollier (2002) describes the academy as a “gift economy.” The gift economy of academia

presumes that research and scholarly resources are produced in accordance with publicly articulated purposes, and supported by the free production and circulation of knowledge, both within and outside of the university. For Bollier, gift economies are “potent systems for eliciting and developing behaviors that the market cannot,” such as honesty, information sharing and mutual collaboration (p. 30). In their seminal work on the scientific enterprise, Robert Merton (1973) and Michael Polanyi (1969) reached similar conclusions about the nature of academic research. Both argued that the products of research should be open and shared and that researchers should be primarily disinterested or motivated by a commitment to advance knowledge rather than personal or financial gain. These are not simply proscriptions for the way academics ought to behave; rather, the open and disinterested nature of academic inquiry is precisely what makes it so innovative. As Jennifer Washburn (2005: 195) explains, the system “does a remarkably good job of speeding the creation of new discoveries, hastening public disclosure, and enabling peers to evaluate and replicate new research findings to ensure their accuracy – all of which helps to broaden the stock of reliable public knowledge that is available for future research and innovation.” These concepts – of knowledge commons and gift economies – are idealized terms. Research secrecy has always had a place in academia, as some professors have always been reluctant to share ideas out of fear that they will be appropriated by others. Nonetheless this practice runs counter to academic ideals and has increased under corporatization.²²⁷

²²⁷ Some have been particularly critical of academics who keep research findings secret. “Like a lie,” writes Robert Wolff (1969: 129), “the commitment to secrecy sunders the moral bond between the members of the university.” A person who keeps their research secret “is no more capable of entering genuinely into the public discourse of the university than is an FBI agent posing as a student radical.”

One of the ways that corporatization has fostered academic secrecy is through the creation of a more competitive, utilitarian and performance-based research culture. For example, as publication productivity becomes more important for academic appointment and promotion there are fewer incentives for collaboration and knowledge sharing among researchers (except in superficial instances of padding curricula vitae through “honorary” publications). The same is true for graduate students, whose PhD experiences increasingly resemble competitive self-marketing marathons. And, as noted previously, greater pressures has been placed on faculty to obtain external grants, which has helped to transform the university from a knowledge sharing institution to a site of competitive fundraisers. As Polster (2007a: 610) discovered in her research, the importance placed on grant acquisition “is reducing some colleagues’ willingness to support one another in a variety of ways, such as reading or discussing research proposals and papers. It is also taking a toll on academic collegialism and morale.”²²⁸ Polster also found that there is a growing tendency for Canadian academics to avoid scientific conferences for fear of disclosing valuable information, and, when they do attend, these “private academics” often refuse to provide details of their research or engage in discussions that might compromise funding or commercial interests (Polster 2000). These trends are only amplified by the fact that researchers and departments that bring in more funding enjoy greater power and influence in the corporate university. The work of academic capitalists in particular, which is less likely to involve open knowledge sharing, is being prioritized over less lucrative forms of inquiry.

²²⁸ This increased emphasis on “performance” and competition in university research has been well documented at some institutions, such as the University of Ottawa, where reduced collegiality was identified as one of the most noticeable consequences (Chan and Fisher 2008b).

In addition to influencing the kinds of research questions that are pursued, corporate sponsorships can also influence research in other ways, including through non-disclosure and intellectual property agreements (discussed in the last section). Whereas academic secrecy is typically a short-term expedient to ensure publication, commercial secrecy can be a lengthy process that remains in place for as long as proprietors deem it to be in their interest. In some cases, contractual arrangements can force academics to transfer the results of their research to the firms who paid for it. In others, the publication of findings may be delayed until a corporate sponsor obtains a patent on its intellectual property. Selective disclosure and withholding of data may also occur if the research results are potentially damaging to the corporate bottom line.

Although the extent of research secrecy in Canada is not well documented, this topic has been explored extensively in the US. To summarize the literature, US research suggests that researchers with industry support are more likely to (i) report that “trade secrets” resulted from their research (information kept secret to protect its proprietary value); (ii) be denied the information/data necessary to publish their results; (iii) delay publication of their research; and (iv) deny other academics access to their data and research results (see, for example, Krinsky 2003; Washburn 2005). Research also suggests that graduate students may be especially vulnerable to secrecy agreements because they rely on the prompt publication of their findings in order to secure funding or employment, yet they are often prevented from publishing in a timely fashion or even from completing their projects. In one Harvard study, researchers found that 88 percent of life sciences companies reported that their university contracts required graduate students and postdoctoral fellows to keep information confidential (Blumenthal et al.

1996). A more recent investigation of graduate students and post-doc holders in computer science, chemical engineering and the life sciences found that one in four had been denied information relevant to their research, and this was especially prevalent in research groups with links to industry (Holden 2006).

Two further examples will be outlined here to illustrate the connections between research secrecy, academic freedom and the corporatization process. The first involves the case of Professor Stéphane McLachlan and graduate student Ian Mauro at the University of Manitoba (U of M). In 2001, McLachlan and Mauro received a grant from the SSHRC to undertake a project on the risks and benefits of genetically modified crops (GMCs). As part of the project, the researchers, along with local activists, produced a documentary film to “bring opinions, concerns and local knowledge of rural communities to the forefront of the GMC debate” (Sanders 2005: 34). Predictably, the opinions expressed by small farmers were highly critical of Monsanto’s agricultural practices. Upon review, the U of M administration refused to allow the film to be screened and blocked its release for nearly three years, fearing litigation from Monsanto and not wanting to interfere with negotiations that would see the company’s Canadian headquarters moved to the U of M’s industrial smartpark. Public pressure and intervention by the CAUT eventually forced the administration to concede to the screening of the film, but with a disclaimer that it did not represent the viewpoints of the university. A second example involves the oil giant British Petroleum (BP) and US universities. In the first few months after the Gulf oil disaster in 2010, BP was enlisting academic scientists all along the Gulf Coast into exclusive research and consulting contracts that were replete with secrecy clauses that barred academics from making their

findings public (Lea 2010). Not only was BP attempting to subvert the scientific process, but it sought to ensure that academic data and evidence about the disaster would be controlled by the company. Both of these incidents, and many others like them, clearly demonstrate how corporate-university alliances have the potential to stifle research in the public interest.

To conclude, research secrecy is incompatible with academic values and has negative implications for researchers, universities and the public at large. Within the academy, secrecy disrupts collegial relationships, reduces knowledge sharing and promotes waste as researchers needlessly duplicate work that was not made freely available. Secrecy also restricts the course of knowledge production because scientific progress depends on researchers building on the findings of others. IP protections such as patents, for example, are highly protectionist and tend to stifle innovation by restricting the diffusion of knowledge both to and from universities (see Fabrizio 2007; Murray and Stern 2007; Rosell and Agrawal 2009). According to Mike Lazaridis (2004: 2), President and Co-CEO of Research in Motion, “patenting is an inherently secretive process requiring its proponents to withdraw from the very processes that expand and transfer knowledge in a research university – open disclosure, peer review, and publication in scientific journals.” Most importantly, research secrecy inhibits the amount of knowledge that is available in the public domain, including in areas such as food production and medicine. Jennifer Washburn (2005) has reported that roughly one quarter of patented inventions in agricultural biotechnology – which have been tied up under restrictive commercial agreements – originated in public institutions at public expense. The same is true of many medicines (e.g., AIDS drugs) and even human genes, which have been

patented and exclusively licensed to biopharmaceutical companies (e.g., the gene responsible for hereditary breast cancer). As universities and academics are increasingly guided by market logic, research secrecy will continue to present a serious threat to the public interest.

Conflicts of Interest and Research Bias

The commercialization of research has brought about other changes in the university research process, including conflicts of interest and research bias. In general, a conflict of interest occurs when a person is inclined or obliged to pursue interests that compete with one another in a fundamental way. More specifically for the purposes of this discussion, conflict of interest situations are those in which financial or other personal considerations may compromise (or have the appearance of compromising) a researcher's professional judgement in considering or reporting research results. An obvious group who are affected by conflicts of interest are senior academic economists in the US (and elsewhere) who occupy lucrative and high ranking positions in governments and/or major financial institutions. As Charles Ferguson (2010) observes, "the economics profession – in economics departments, and in business, public policy, and law schools – has become so compromised by conflicts of interest that it now functions almost as a support group for financial services and other industries whose profits depend heavily on government policy." Ferguson adds that the buildup to the 2008 financial crisis "runs straight through the economics discipline." What is particularly noteworthy about academic conflicts of interest is that they are rarely disclosed. For example, one study examining 62,000 articles in 210 scientific journals found that only one half of one percent included relevant information about authors' research-related financial ties, even though all of the

journals formally required such disclosure (see King 1999). Conflicts of interest may be especially damaging for universities; short of outright fraud, nothing is as threatening to the integrity of the university than the perception that it has been bought off.

There is no shortage of scholars who, by virtue of their corporate and other connections, are affected by conflicts of interests. One of the main consequences of this conflict is the resulting research bias. In some cases, research bias results from direct corporate censorship or academic corruption. For example, one study of university-industry engineering research centres in the US found that 35 percent allowed corporations to delete information from papers prior to publication (Washburn 2005). Likewise, a small minority of academics have deliberately falsified results to produce findings that accord with their interests or those of their sponsor. However, a much more prescient cause of research bias is the *unconscious* effect of financial benefit or career advancement. The logic is simple: researchers with a vested interest in reaching a particular conclusion will tend to weigh arguments and evidence in a biased fashion. The mechanisms though which this occurs are varied and subtle, including how questions are framed, how studies are designed, how contrary interpretations are emphasized and how conclusions are worded. Complicating matters is that the vast majority of academics perceive themselves to be objective and impartial, and corporate sponsors often recognize the importance of encouraging researchers to “feel” impartial (Freudenburg 2005). In any event, a substantial body of empirical evidence indicates that even if corporate sponsors allow researchers free reign over the research process – which they often do not – projects financed by big business are far more likely to reach conclusions that support the interests of their sponsor.

Many areas of academic research have been affected by research bias. One of the most obvious examples is food and nutrition. Researcher Marion Nestle (2007) has documented the extensive network through which food companies sponsor nutrition research, nutrition conferences, food and nutrition journals and the activities of professional societies. As a result, research findings in this area often favour the interests of their sponsors. In fact, Nestle reports that sponsorship almost invariably predicts the results of research into specific foods or nutrients. Similarly, Lenard Lesser and his colleagues (2007) looked at studies on the relationship between soft drinks and childhood obesity. They found that while independent studies almost always find an association between habitual consumption of soft drinks and obesity, industry-sponsored studies rarely do.

Tobacco research offers another example of how industry funding distorts the research process. One study found that 94 percent of articles that had authors who were affiliated with the tobacco industry concluded that second hand smoke was not harmful. In contrast, only 13 percent of articles where the authors had no tobacco ties reached the same conclusion (Barnes and Bero 1998). When the researchers ran a multivariate regression controlling for other variables (article quality, peer review status, article topic and year of publication), having an author with a tobacco-company affiliation was the *only* variable associated with the conclusion that second-hand smoke is not harmful. The basic strategy of the tobacco industry has been to use university scientists to make the dangers of cigarettes appear controversial. These companies depend on the fact that observers tend to associate academic research with independence and impartiality. Of course, this is not only true of tobacco companies; “decency by association” is one of the

reasons why most corporations that produce harmful products or engage in destructive practices actively seek academic partnerships. In the area of climate science, this is precisely why “academics, and not the president of Imperial Oil, are chosen to deliver the message that global warming is not occurring” (Gutstein 2009: 305). The ability of the tobacco industry to downplay the risks of tobacco consumption partly resided in the extensive network of ties it had created with medical researchers (Cohen 2008; Kaufman et al. 2004). Although these relationships have dissipated in recent years, the same cannot be said about the relationship between academic medicine and the pharmaceutical industry. More than any other area of academic research, conflicts of interest in biomedicine are threatening the health and well-being of the general population.

Big Pharma, Biotechnology and the Perversion of Academic Medicine

Historically, medical schools and researchers advanced medical science (and built their reputations) by maintaining clear boundaries between the academy and industry. In the area of pharmaceuticals, academic distrust of business ran especially high (Atkinson-Grosjean and Fairly 2009). In Canada, this changed in the late 1980s when government support for medical research declined and medical schools embraced the pharmaceutical industry as a way to maintain a stable influx of new funds. These efforts were facilitated in 1992 by the creation of the Council for Biomedical and Health Research, which brought together the Association of Canadian Medical Colleges (representing 16 university faculties of medicine), the Canadian Federation of Biological Societies and the Health Research Foundation of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers’ Association to generate public support for drug-related research. At the same time, the field of biotechnology expanded in Canadian universities and set the stage for widespread

commercial involvement in biomedicine. Over the past few decades, the life sciences – mostly represented by biotechnology – has accounted for a disproportionate share of Canadian universities’ commercial output (Niosi 2006).²²⁹

Today, the association between Big Pharma, medical science and university facilities and researchers is well established. Drug companies spend billions each year wooing physicians (more than they spend on consumer advertising or research) in order to generate support for their products, align medical research with corporate interests, and amass a network of well-respected consultants and lobbyists. According to one estimate, 94 percent of psychiatrists-in-training have accepted gifts from pharmaceutical firms by their third year (Ferrie 2013). Further, Canadian medical researcher Joel Lexchin (2010) notes that drug companies in Canada spend between \$2.4 and \$4.8 billion annually pushing their drugs to doctors. The pharmaceutical industry also provides hundreds of millions of dollars in financial subsidies to medical journals via the purchase of advertisements and special supplements, and it spends billions more on continuing medical education (CME) programs. Sales and marketing divisions dominate corporate decision-making around the distribution of CME money because the primary goal of these “public service” programs is to push new drugs (Ridgeway 2010). Through these marketing and outreach efforts, corporations have infiltrated medical schools. In the US, for example, a recent survey found that nearly two thirds of department heads at medical schools and teaching hospitals had financial or other ties to industry (Mangan 2007).

According to the *New England Journal of Medicine*, a national sample of over 3,100 US

²²⁹ The integration of universities and biotechnology firms is now so commonplace that it has created the unusual situation where the field’s leading academic scientists dominate technology transfer to industry, while many of the most influential publications are written by research teams from the private sector (Geiger 2004; Kleinman and Vallas 2001; Vallas and Kleinman 2008).

physicians revealed that 94 percent were involved with drug companies and 28 percent were paid consultants for the industry (Campbell et al. 2007). A further set of connections involves the millions of clinical trials for drugs and other medical treatments that are conducted in academic medical centres around the world. Industry funds approximately 70 percent of all clinical trials and 70 percent of these are run by contract research organizations that produce data that is wholly owned by their sponsors (Sismondo 2009a). Although clinical trials are ostensibly “research” activities, a large proportion amount to commercial product testing. Remarkably, even members of institutional review boards and committees, whose job it is to “police the researchers” and protect human participants in medical trials, have extensive conflicts of interest because of their relationships with the drug industry (Brainard 2006).

As this cursory review makes clear, a myriad of conflicts of interest are involved in the relationship between corporations, the medical profession and biomedical researchers. In fact, medical journal editors now frequently complain that they can no longer find academic experts without conflicts of interest.²³⁰ The most common conflicts are financial in nature; these range from the provision of “hands-off” corporate sponsorships to situations where researchers hold a personal financial stake in their research outcomes. The latter case is especially troublesome, yet surprisingly common. In his seminal study, Sheldon Krinsky and his colleagues (1996) looked at the industry connections of the authors of 789 scientific papers published by 1,105 researchers in 14 major life science

²³⁰ Ellen Schrecker (2010) recounts an incident where the *New England Journal of Medicine* decided to ban authors with a financial interest in any company (or its competitor) that made a product discussed in the author’s work. It eventually had to add the word “significant” because the editors could find only one submission over the previous two years that complied with the requirement. Likewise, the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* attempted to implement a similar conflict of interest policy but the editors could not find enough qualified researchers that did not have ties to drug companies. For additional examples, see Washburn (2005: Chapter 5, note 9).

and biomedical journals. The study found that 34 percent of the articles (267) had at least one lead author with a financial interest in the outcome of the research (not one article disclosed this interest).²³¹ Moreover, the 34 percent figure likely underrepresented the actual level of conflict of interest because the researchers were unable to account for certain variables, such as authors who received consulting fees from companies involved in commercial applications of their work. Shortly after the release of Krimsky's findings, the leading life sciences journal *Nature* (1997: 469) published a statement in which it acknowledged that financial conflicts of interests were common in biomedical research, but asserted that this was of little consequence. According to the journal, Krimsky's study provided no evidence that the "undeclared interests led to any fraud, deception or bias in presentation, and until there is evidence that there are serious risks of such malpractice, this journal will persist in its stubborn belief that research as we publish it is indeed research, not business."

Since *Nature's* aggressive rejoinder, an abundance of evidence has been accumulated supporting the hypothesis that corporate funding and conflicts of interest are associated with research bias in the medical field. This pattern holds not only for research where investigators have a personal stake in the outcome, but for industry-sponsored studies more generally. For example, Mildred Cho and Lisa Bero (1996) found that 98 percent of drug studies funded by pharmaceutical companies reached favourable conclusions about drug safety and efficacy, compared with 79 percent of studies not funded by industry. Another investigation found that studies of cancer drugs funded by

²³¹ "Financial interest" in this study included (i) serving on a scientific advisory board of a biotechnology company that develops products in the area related to the scientist's research; (ii) holding a position as an officer, director or major shareholder in a company whose products are related to the scientist's research; and/or (iii) possessing a patent or a patent application closely related to the scientist's work.

drug companies were nearly eight times less likely to research unfavorable conclusions compared with similar studies funded by non-profit organizations (Friedberg et al. 1999). Similarly, medical researchers in Toronto reported a strong association between purported drug safety and financial conflicts of interest (Stelfox et al. 1998). More specifically, they found that 96 percent of authors whose findings supported the safety of a particular class of drugs had a financial relationship with the drug manufacturers, compared with 60 percent of “neutral” authors and 37 percent of authors who were critical of the drugs’ safety.

More recently, several meta-analyses of the biomedical literature have provided compelling evidence about the linkages between industry funding and research bias. The first by Justin Bekelman, Yan Li and Cary Gross (2003), looked at research published over a 23-year period on the extent, impact and management of conflicts of interest in biomedical research. They found a strong and consistent correlation between industry sponsorship (mainly, but not all pharmaceutical) and pro-industry conclusions. In a similar review, Lexchin et al. (2003) found that studies funded by pharmaceutical companies were far more likely to have outcomes favouring their sponsors than studies sponsored by other organizations, and that “systematic bias” favours products that are made by companies funding university research. Some years later, Sergio Sismondo (2008) found that 17 out of 19 studies investigating the effects of drug company sponsorships showed an association (usually a strong association) between industry

sponsorship and pro-industry conclusions.²³² Taken together, these studies illustrate the impact of corporate power in academic medicine and the important differences between publicly funded versus privately funded research.

It should be noted that in addition to research bias, outright research fraud is also on the rise. In a comprehensive review of retracted biomedical and life sciences articles listed in the PubMed database, 43.4 percent were found to be retracted due to fraud or suspected fraud (Fang, Steen and Casadevall 2012). The review also found that the percentage of scientific articles retracted due to fraud has increased 10-fold since 1975.²³³ A second review of survey research on scientific misconduct found that falsifying data is far more common than previously estimated, and that this form of misconduct is reported most frequently in the case of medical and pharmacological research (Fanelli 2009). Further, approximately one third of respondents in the study admitted to some form of questionable research practice, such as altering the research design, methodology or results in response to pressures from funders. More evidence of biomedical fraud came to light in 2012, when a team of 100 scientists tried to replicate the results of 53 of the most widely cited cancer research papers. This effort resulted in only six research studies being validated, while the rest could not be replicated. “Shockingly,” writes medical journalist Helke Ferrie (2013: 284), “this was not Pharma-generated junk science, but came from university researchers who misled companies wanting to use their research for new

²³² Within this larger review, Sismondo (2008) reports that of 100 articles published in the pulmonary/allergy literature, 98 percent of articles sponsored by drug companies reported findings that were favourable to the drug being studied (compared with 32 percent of other articles). Moreover, in a sample of 542 articles on clinical trials in psychiatry, 78 percent of sponsored studies favoured the sponsor’s drug versus only 48 percent of those without industry sponsorship.

²³³ Other researchers have found that co-authors of retracted papers who are *not* personally implicated in the research misconduct often incur serious career consequences as a result, including publishing difficulties, having work cited less frequently and a reduced ability to pursue a scientific career (Lambert-Chan 2013).

cancer drugs. Indeed, there is no honour among thieves.” All of these studies of research fraud support the growing consensus that corporate money in academic medicine is distorting scientific evidence to promote commercial interests.

Corporate funding and conflicts of interest help to explain the preponderance of research bias in academic medicine, but it is not the whole story. Under corporatization, academics are increasingly ceding control over every stage of the clinical research process. The next section explores the practices of ghost-writing and ghost-management in biomedical research.

Ghost-Writing and Ghost-Management

Within the biomedical literature, corporate employees routinely write “academic” papers that emerge from corporate-sponsored research. This practice – often referred to as “ghostwriting” – generally works as follows: when research results are ready to be written up, a corporation’s marketing department will contract with medical writers from a public relations or “medical communications” firm to produce a manuscript. After several drafts have been completed, the manuscript is then inspected by the company’s marketing and legal departments for approval. It is usually around this time that an academic “author” will inspect and sign off on the article. When the article subsequently appears in a pre-selected journal, the ghost-writer(s) either disappear or are subtly acknowledged as providing some form of editorial assistance. Frequently, the academic who assumes authorship will not have had access to the data on which the study is based and, in the worst cases, is simply paid to have his or her name appear on a publication. The compensation rates for professors who participate in ghostwriting can be as high as \$10,000 for a single article, especially if they continue to present the findings at

conferences or in medical education lectures (Krimsky 2003). Meanwhile, professional ghost-writers are often paid between \$10,000 and \$20,000 per article and have annual salaries that can exceed \$100,000 (Mirowski and Van Horn 2005; Schafer 2004).

How prevalent is ghostwriting in the medical literature? Given the inherent secrecy of the process, firm data are not available. Evidence suggests, however, that the practice is commonplace (e.g., Basken 2009; Lacasse and Leo 2010). In fact, according to one study, the *majority* of articles on pharmaceutical drugs in leading medical journals are likely to be wholly or partially ghostwritten (Healy and Cattell 2003). David Healy has even suggested that in some areas – such as on-patent drugs and the safety/effectiveness of anti-depressants for *children* – virtually all of the published literature includes material that is authored by medical writers or pharmaceutical company personnel (Fine 2009b, Healy 2008). More recent evidence suggests that the practice of ghostwriting now extends to medical textbook publishing (Wilson 2010).

As disturbing as these practices are, ghostwriting is only one part of an increasingly sophisticated system of “ghost-management” in medical research (Sismondo 2007, 2009b). Ghost-management refers to the broader phenomenon whereby drug companies and their agents direct and shape the entire research process, from funding and design to publication and promotion. This process often begins before the onset of the research trials when company officials, in consultation with “publication planning” companies, shape the research design. The corporations participating in these networks sometimes manipulate trial design in ways that escape detection by peer review processes, including by conducting a trial drug against a treatment known to be inferior, excluding placebo responders, and testing a drug against too low a dose from a competitor’s drug (Smith

2005). Many companies also conduct multicentre trials and artificially select for results that are favourable to their interests. Before and during the trials, the corporate network will also select target journals and audiences, anticipate peer-review criticism, and identify which academics (ideally “key opinion leaders” in the field) are going to be included as authors. It is especially important for publication planners to get involved early if “there is a need to create a market or to create an understanding of unmet need,” otherwise known as “disease mongering” or “selling sickness” (Sismondo 2009b: 177). A well ghost-managed publication may also include the targeting of conferences and professional meetings where results can be advertised and the development of other communication opportunities such as “symposia and round-tables, journal supplements, advisory board meetings, slide programs, formulary kits, and more” (p. 176).

The size of the publication planning industry continues to grow. Over 50 different agencies openly advertise publication planning services, and many of them boast of having hundreds of employees who handle hundreds of manuscripts each year. In fact, the industry is large enough that two international associations of publication planners exist to organize seminars and meetings (the International Society of Medical Planning Professionals and the International Publication Planning Association). According to Sismondo (2009b: 172), up to 40 percent of “important journal reports of clinical trials of new drugs (and, more anecdotally, perhaps a higher percentage of meeting presentations on clinical trials) are ghost-managed through to publication.” Thus, the large number of medical writing and medical education and communication firms, whose tasks are generally limited to ghostwriting and preparing presentations, may be viewed as adjuncts to the more sophisticated work of publication planners. Medical journals should not be

seen as dupes in this process, as many editors have extensive dealings with publication planners and are fully aware of the process.

Ghost-management and publication planning have as a primary goal the extraction of monetary value from scientific research. Needless to say, they amplify research bias because commercial interests are involved at every stage of the research process. These practices should not be seen as a breakdown of ethical standards or editorial oversight; on the contrary, this is a well-organized industry that forms an integral part of the corporate production of knowledge.

Assessing the Impact

The corporatization of academic medicine has had an profound impact on researchers, universities and the public. For researchers, it has reduced their ability to pursue independent lines of scholarship, increased restrictions on academic freedom and, in some instances, resulted in severe consequences for scholars who defy this corporate-university complex. The high profile cases of Nancy Olivieri and David Healy in Canada, the details of which have been documented elsewhere, are cases in point.²³⁴ For universities and the medical profession, it has produced an unprecedented crisis of credibility in the published literature and tarnished the academy as a source of disinterested research. The public impact, however, goes much deeper. For one, underwriting the costs of drug research is a costly venture. Canadian taxpayers pay most

²³⁴ For firsthand accounts, see Olivieri (2000) and Healy (2008). For useful overviews, see Schafer (2005) and Woodhouse (2009: Chapter 3). What was most disturbing about the two cases was not the behaviour of the drug companies but the behaviour of the university. When Olivieri and Healy were removed from their positions at the University of Toronto, university and hospital officials failed to recognize – or, at least, failed to acknowledge – that their actions represented outrageous violations of academic freedom. The treatment of Olivieri was especially heinous. Professor Margaret Somerville, Founding Director of the Faculty of Law's Centre for Medicine, Ethics and Law at McGill University, has stated that the Olivieri case “reads like a horror story on the involvement of corporations in university-based research” (cited in Woodhouse 2009: 109).

of the costs of discovering and developing new drugs, and they pay again as consumers for mass marketed treatments that offer little or no benefit. Evidence from France and Canada suggests that no more than 15 percent of new drugs represent any significant therapeutic advantage over those that already exist (Lexchin 2010).

There are also severe risks associated with corporatized medical research. Not only are violations of human research protection rules on the rise, but adverse trial events are increasingly treated as “confidential commercial information” and never made public. As well, the many drug scandals that have erupted in recent years illustrate the human toll that can result from corporate sponsorships, compromised clinical trials, research bias, data suppression and inadequate oversight. In the case of Vioxx, for example, millions of people took the drug before it was exposed as causing a serious risk of heart attack and stroke, a fact that was known to academic and corporate researchers but explained away and eventually suppressed (Schafer 2008). One estimate suggests that half a million premature deaths in the US alone may have been caused by Vioxx use (Cockburn 2012). Compromised research and publishing practices also explain, in part, why hundreds of thousands of Americans die each year from “correctly” prescribed drugs (Starfield 2000). Ferrie (2009) reports that this figure for Canada is at least 23,000 annually. With approximately 20 percent of the North American population currently consuming pharmaceutical drugs for anxiety, depression, and other ailments, and with pharmaceuticals and medicine accounting for the largest number of industry-sponsored research contracts in Canadian universities, these issues could not be more pressing (Council of Canadian Academies 2012b).

While there has been some effort to address these problems on the part of medical schools and journals in recent years, most research universities and medical centres remain heavily integrated with and influenced by the pharmaceutical industrial complex. There is also increasing corporate and government pressure to reduce regulations on drug research and eliminate independent watchdog groups. In 2011, for example, the Harper government put the interests of industry ahead of patient safety when the CIHR eliminated its internationally praised transparency requirement for full public disclosure of trial drug results. The policy, which was just three months old when it was scrapped, required scientists funded by the agency to reveal all their raw data to the public, regardless of what they chose to publish. More recently in 2013, the internationally acclaimed Therapeutics Initiative (TI) based out of the University of British Columbia had all of its funding suspended by the BC government under pressure from Big Pharma.²³⁵ In the corporate university, marketing and profit continue to replace science as compromised research infiltrates the peer-reviewed literature and the “knowledge” base of physicians.

Conclusions: Shifting Research Agendas

As discussed throughout this chapter, the corporatization of academic research – a process endorsed by the private sector, governments and universities alike – has gone hand in hand with the decline of basic research funding. It is useful, in closing, to briefly consider some of the long-term implications of this trend. For one, the importance of

²³⁵ TI has been conducting independent, evidence-based drug reviews for the BC government since the 1990s. It has been reported, for example, that TI’s work indirectly saved an estimated 500 lives in the province with its independent assessment of Vioxx (Canadian Health Coalition 2010).

basic research to humanity is well understood. Throughout history, academic investigations that appeared to be irrelevant at the time have yielded many of the world's important scientific and technological advancements. In the area of medicine, for example, these have included MRIs, x-rays and penicillin, just to name a few. Indeed, the majority of scientific breakthroughs in virtually every field have resulted from basic research conducted in academic settings built and supported largely by public funds. Although Canada currently ranks fourth in the world in terms of the quality of its basic peer reviewed scientific research, it continues to lag well behind other countries in the generation of patents and other intellectual property (Council of Canadian Academies 2012b). The response of the federal government has been to wind down basic research, hand over scientific resources to the private sector and invest in research with immediate commercial application. Needless to say, such a strategy is damaging from the point of view of the public interest.²³⁶

There is reason to believe that this strategy is also damaging to the economic interests it purports to serve. Most of the major scientific discoveries and breakthroughs of major commercial significance have also been produced through basic research. Simply put, basic inquiry yields economic benefits (for an overview, see Salter and Martin 2001). In fact, many of the private sector's most dynamic industries owe their origins and livelihood (not to mention profits) to publicly funded curiosity-driven research. This includes biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, which are often seen as

²³⁶ In recognition of the importance of basic research, over 3,000 British professors – including six Nobel Laureates – recently signed a petition opposing a government proposal requiring 25 percent of government-financed academic research to be assessed on its immediate “economic impact.” The professors asserted that this measure would hinder the kind of fundamental research that has been at the centre of social and scientific advancement (Labi 2009).

quintessential examples of successful corporatization. One study by researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that publicly funded research was a critical contributor to the discovery of nearly all of the 25 most important new drugs introduced between 1970 and 1995. Likewise, basic research was crucial for the establishment of biotechnology. According to Nobel Prize-winning scientist Paul Berg, the biotech revolution “would not have happened had the whole thing been left to industry. Venture-capital people steered clear of anything that didn’t have obvious commercial value or short-term impact. They didn’t fund the basic research that made biotechnology possible” (cited in Washburn 2005: 241). Of course, I would add that the profits of corporations should rank at the bottom of the list of reasons why the commercial agenda in higher education should be opposed, as the educational and social implications far outweigh the economic ones in importance. Nevertheless, it is important (and ironic) to recognize that by reducing the university’s relative freedom from market constraints, governments and the private sector are, in all likelihood, working against their own interests.

Chapter Nine Concluding Remarks

Higher education has undergone a series of changes under corporatization. More and more, governance models reflect business objectives and modes of operation; teaching is focused on vocational training and carried out by casualized labour; and research is conducted to serve corporate interests. Based on this state of affairs, some hold a pessimistic view of the “runaway” changes that universities are confronting. Writing about the restructuring taking place in higher education back in 2002, Paul Axelrod (2002: 5) remarked:

It is possible that a decade from now our universities will resemble little more than giant training warehouses, where short-term corporate needs dictate curricula to students who are increasingly taught not by professors but by advanced, impersonal technology. Research, funded primarily by private industry, will be designed to produce profitably-sold products, and will no longer engage the study of non-marketable ideas. ‘Higher’ education will be banal and completely regulated by external authorities. Those interested in exploring the world of ideas might have to set up new institutions (without public funding).

Yet, Axelrod’s vision has not yet come to pass. Canadian universities have not been reduced to simple “knowledge factories” or “handmaidens of industry,” and they have not been entirely corrupted by corporate values. Professors in many academic fields are able to define and regulate their own research agendas, and universities continue to produce independent research consistent with the public interest. The responsibilities and mandates of public universities still hold, albeit tenuously, to the ideals of critical teaching and scholarship.

I would argue, however that Canadian universities are approaching a critical juncture. If they do not reverse the current move toward corporatization, they risk being

permanently transformed into institutions whose primary purposes are job training and enhancing corporate profits. To better understand this transformation – and inform thinking on how best to resist it – I undertook this research on the history, root causes and impacts of the corporatization of higher education in Canada. Universities play a substantial role in shaping the political economy of Canada and the lives of Canadians, and understanding if and how this role is changing is critically important. For one, we live in a socioeconomic context where more and more Canadians are pursuing a university education and where these credentials are increasingly linked to (and required to obtain) stable and meaningful employment. At the same time, growth in the number of occupations requiring a university education means that universities are now indispensable for labour markets and for Canada’s economic future (Miner 2010). But the importance of universities as an object of analysis goes beyond the increasing number of students or labour market connections. Universities can and do play a critical role in bringing about social change. While they support dominant social interests and institutions, universities are also one of the only institutions that encourage the development of new social visions and modes of thought. They continue to be a place where critical analysis and radical scholarship can be freely conducted, and they are counted on to challenge established structures of power and provide a reliable source of disinterested inquiry. The process of corporatization puts this role of the university in jeopardy, and understanding the evolution of this process in the Canadian context is a necessary step in resisting it.

This study takes this step as it is the first comprehensive study of corporatization in Canada. The majority of previous work on university restructuring either analyzed

changes at the provincial level or focused on discrete elements of the restructuring process. To address this gap, this pan-national study of corporatization incorporated an extensive range of indicators and outcomes, including federal and provincial higher education policy, the casualization of academic labour, university funding, curriculum reform, university governance, infrastructure development, the commercialization of research and the political economy of student life. In this concluding chapter, I will briefly review some of the key questions and claims that I explored throughout my study, as well as outline some of its limitations and directions for future research. The chapter concludes with a discussion of challenges and resistance to corporatization.

Studying the Corporatization of Higher Education in Canada

Two overarching questions of interest guided this research: (i) how has the corporatization of Canadian universities taken shape?; and (ii) what are the consequences of this restructuring both for higher education and society at large? In exploring these general areas of inquiry, I relied primarily on documentary analysis and a large inventory of qualitative and quantitative data sources, including academic and lay publications, surveys, historiographies, government policy documents and reports, media articles, federal and provincial statistics and databases, university statistics and documentary records, as well as numerous publications by organizations engaged in policy work on higher education. I critically engaged with the theoretical and philosophical literature on higher education in order to frame my critique throughout, especially as it pertained to debates about the relationship between higher learning and business. I also drew upon international examples, primarily US examples, to provide a comparative lens where

appropriate. In order to investigate the specific evolution and impacts of the casualization of academic labour, I created a new dataset based on access to information requests on academic faculty in Ontario. While these varied sources of information allowed for a rich and comprehensive analysis of the issue, the relative lack of data on some of the outcomes of Canada's higher education systems (and the recent cuts to/elimination of government funded research bodies) means that there are some gaps in this analysis. Additional information on these gaps is detailed below when I discuss some of the limitations of the research.

Throughout this study, I have presented research to support my central claims, which are that universities and corporations are different and incompatible institutions (discussed in greater detail later in the chapter); that the introduction of business interests and models to universities is fundamentally transforming their functions and roles; and that the impacts of this transformation are primarily negative, both for the institution itself and for society. For example, in Chapters 4 and 5, I discuss how corporatization has impacted university teaching, and with it the nature of academic work. In the corporatized university, the importance attached to university research has increased while the resources and institutional supports for teaching have declined. At the same time, there has been a marked increase in the casualization of academic labour. Universities are increasingly using part-time (and full-time) contractual arrangements to meet hiring requirements, and a distinct three-tiered academic hierarchy is beginning to emerge. At the same time, as I detail in Chapter 6, students are being transformed into educational consumers under corporatization. The new "student-consumer" model of higher learning has influenced students' goals and values, educational choices, social

identities, learning experiences, finances, career prospects and relationship with the university. Moreover, as demonstrated in Chapter 7, there has been a proliferation of corporate management models in higher education and the role and function of administrators has changed. In the corporatized university, administrators are being recast in the role of corporate managers and have increased their political influence within the university by appropriating power from faculty and academic bodies. In Chapter 8, I demonstrate the validity of these claims by looking specifically at the impact of corporatization on university research. Federal (and provincial) research policies have been pivotal in aligning university research with the interests of private power, at the same time as university administrations and academic capitalists have expanded the commercial orientation of academic inquiry. This corporate influence has, in effect, corrupted academic research, as evidenced by changes in the selection of research topics and research secrecy, and growing conflicts of interest and research bias in the collection and release of information.

As noted in the opening chapter, the idea that universities are approaching a “crisis” has been a consistent theme in the higher education literature for decades. And one of the major shortcomings of this literature has been its failure to provide convincing evidence that such a crisis was imminent. In Glen Jones’ terms (1990), it is “not enough simply to identify a problem or demonstrate an element of decline ... One must provide evidence that the problem is of such a magnitude that a failure to resolve the problem will lead to a decisive moment in which some characteristic of higher education will be threatened” (p. 3). This study rises to Jones’ challenge by bringing together a wide range of historical and empirical evidence on the corporatization of Canadian universities. Taken together,

this evidence supports the central claims of my research. It illustrates the conflict between university and business priorities and practices; it demonstrates that many of the defining characteristics of the public university are currently being threatened, particularly its systems of governance, and its approach to teaching and research; and it outlines the negative consequences of this shift, for instructors, for researchers, for students and for the public.

Limitations and Areas for Future Research

The education landscape in Canada is complex, in light of both the differing federal and provincial/territorial responsibilities and contexts across the country, as well as differences between universities and within different disciplines. Where possible, care was taken in this study to attend to the unique political and educational histories in different provinces in order to provide a comprehensive picture of university restructuring and demonstrate provincial variation (e.g., differential policies around student tuition, aid and debt). I also elaborated on the differential pressures facing small, undergraduate institutions and large research-centred universities, as well as the differential impacts of corporatization (e.g., the commercialization of research) on liberal arts disciplines and “applied” fields of study. Having said that, there were areas where data was not available for a particular province or type of institution, and I needed to select particular examples and focus at a high level in order to present an overarching narrative on the situation in Canada. In other words, my analysis remained, for the most part, at the national and university level. The chief limitation of my study, then, is that my generalized analytical approach came at the expense of comparative empirical depth;

variations between provinces, institutions and subject areas were sometimes neglected or passed over without appropriate analysis.

One potential area of future research would involve addressing these gaps and assessing provincial variation with respect to the timing, breadth and intensity of corporatization, with a view to understanding if and how different provincial policies and contexts intersect with the corporatization process. One question that emerged from my research, for example, is whether “Quebec exceptionalism” is largely confined to differential policies around tuition and student aid, or whether the province offers a genuine alternative to the neoliberal higher education agenda more broadly. More research is also needed to assess the differences across universities and subject areas. Although these kinds of micro-analyses of specific institutions or disciplines would not be likely to show a fundamental divergence in terms of the overall direction of educational change, they would be useful to highlight important sources of differential agency, or the differing capacities of students and academics in certain disciplines and universities to resist the corporatization agenda. Indeed, the capacity for resistance is one area where future research would yield especially important results.

Throughout the process of undertaking this study, a number of other areas emerged as potential areas for future research. For example, to what extent do the trends in the casualization of academic labour I identified in the Ontario context apply to the rest of the country? Are there meaningful differences by province or by region? If so, what explains these differences? To date, no reliable data exist that would allow researchers to report on trends and document changes in academic labour across Canada. On the specific issue of the casualization of academic labour, it would also be interesting to

further explore differential impacts for women and men. Existing research suggests that women are differentially, and more negatively, impacted by such processes, but no comprehensive data exists to document the full extent of the problem. In gathering the data on academic labour, I indirectly gained valuable insights on the perspectives of university administrators. Future qualitative research – involving interviews with administrators in different kinds of institutions, at different levels and within different disciplines – would illuminate how administrators understand, explain, support and/or resist the changes associated with corporatization taking place within their institutions. In the area of the commercialization of academic research, more studies are needed on the detrimental consequences of this shift. What are the consequences of this shift in attention to corporate-driven research objectives? What important areas of research are no longer receiving adequate academic attention? At the same time, additional research is needed on the specific impacts of these changes on students, in terms of educational access and the choices they make in their areas of study and future areas of work.

In the remainder of the chapter, I address some of the visions and strategies that have been or could be used in resisting the corporatization threat. My main arguments are twofold. First, resistance efforts should be informed by the data and evidence about the corporatization process itself. In my view, this evidence supports that there is a deep incompatibility or mismatch between university and corporate institutions, which means that strategies that simply aim to “regulate” corporatization (or accommodate the broader process through piecemeal reforms) will be ineffective in the long-term. Second, students and faculty need to locate educational reform within a wider critique of the capitalist

system and form alliances with broader social movements operating outside of the university.

Regulating Corporatization: The Views of Centrist Critics

“Centrist” critics tend to support the use of regulatory strategies to address corporatization, thereby occupying a middle ground in debates over university restructuring. These kinds of analyses – such as that of former Harvard University president Derek Bok (2003) – represent the dominant critiques of corporatization in the higher education literature. These critics acknowledge that corporatization is problematic, and often use a cost-benefit approach to evaluate it. In his work, Roger Geiger (2004: 265-266) presents some of the pros and cons typical of cost-benefit analyses of educational restructuring:

the marketplace has, on balance, brought universities greater resources, better students, a far larger capacity for advancing knowledge, and a more productive role in the U.S. economy. At the same time, it has diminished the sovereignty of universities over their own activities, weakened their mission of serving the public, and created through growing commercial entanglements at least the potential for undermining their privileged role as disinterested arbiters of knowledge. The gains have been for the most part material, quantified, and valuable; the losses intangible, unmeasured, and at some level invaluable. The consequences of the university’s immersion in the marketplace are thus incommensurate.

Centrist critics also promote the principle of “institutional balance.” This principle is based on the assumption that academic values and autonomy can be effectively preserved if corporate involvement in university affairs is kept within limits, and if university activities do not stray too far in the direction of corporate/government mandates (see Newson and Polster 2008).

Generally, centrist critics share the baseline assumption with corporatization's supporters that there is no alternative. Given that at least some degree of market restructuring is inevitable, they see the goal as "making peace" with the market while trying to preserve academic values and some semblance of collegial governance. According to Bok (2003: 176), corporate involvement in university research may warrant radical action, but the only viable response at this point is to "tighten up the rules to limit the damage." By accepting the corporatization process as a given and focusing on the need to balance market forces and the public interest, the main issue for these critics is whether corporatization overshadows or unduly compromises the traditional functions of higher education. The key questions of interest then become: (i) to what *degree* should higher education adapt to market forces? and (ii) how can we *reconcile* commercial and academic values? In response to these kinds of considerations, centrist critics tend to favour a utilitarian model of higher education that is a blend of "traditional" and corporate features. It follows that these critics – who often include university administrators and faculty organizations – generally advocate targeted reforms or regulatory strategies to address the problems of corporatization. Some of the common proposed strategies include institutional guidelines and model clauses for regulating corporate-university partnerships; conflict of interest regulations; stricter rules for governing the academic freedom of researchers; progressive accountability measures (e.g., "better" ranking systems); subjecting administrators to greater monitoring; and improving or "regularizing" positions for contract faculty. To be sure, these kinds of reforms have played an important role in "limiting the damage," as Bok suggests.

But the impact of these reformist strategies is limited to the short-term and, in some cases, is even harmful. For one, they provide the illusion that the problems associated with corporatization are being dealt with, which reinforces the broader transformative process and renders it invisible. Second, by focusing efforts on regulating corporatization, they do not allow for questions about whether the restructuring process itself is a legitimate one. Those who develop and implement these kinds of strategies tacitly concede that corporatization is acceptable so long as academic autonomy is protected and the harmful “excesses” of corporate involvement are kept in check. Related to this, reformist strategies tend to start from a defensive position where individuals and groups are reacting to symptoms of the process as they arise, rather than challenging the root causes. Finally, and most importantly, proponents of regulatory reform do not acknowledge the underlying problem of institutional compatibility. That is, they assume that an appropriate “blend” of corporate and academic features in the university can be achieved. I would maintain, however, that it is neither desirable nor possible to successfully reconcile corporate values, standards and structures with academic ones. As Thorstein Veblen (1918) argued nearly a century ago, there is a fundamental incompatibility between business enterprise and higher learning, such that they should properly be considered polar opposites or “two extremes.” As a result, the risk is not that corporatization will overshadow or “unduly compromise” the university, it is that corporatization will irrevocably transform the university. The following outlines why regulation will not and cannot address the problems associated with the corporatization of the university in the long-term.

Irreconcilable Differences

As discussed in Chapter 2, universities function to preserve class privilege and protect and legitimate the social order at the same time as they are subversive institutions that are counted on to produce disinterested knowledge and challenge systems of power and authority. The first of these functions aligns with corporatization. The second, which is rooted in academic freedom and collegial self-governance, does not. Therefore, it has been an ongoing source of tension for government officials, business managers and university administrators who are working to restructure higher education. The incompatibility between universities and corporate institutions manifests itself in two basic ways: (i) corporate-university alliances where universities collaborate *with* corporations (e.g., corporate sponsorships, research partnerships and donor agreements), and (ii) programs of internal restructuring where universities operate *like* corporations (e.g., corporate governance models and academic capitalism). This incompatibility also manifests itself in the outcomes or consequences of these practices and relationships (e.g., the casualization of academic labour and student consumerism). In the remainder of this section, I elaborate on this notion of institutional incompatibility and discuss the implications for resistance and activism.

Early critics of the role of business in higher education, like Veblen, were cognizant of the tensions between the university's teaching, research and public service missions and the demands of market capitalism. Not surprisingly, this stream of critique has become more commonplace as corporatization has advanced. John McMurtry's "Education and the Market Model" (1991) is one of the clearest expositions of the paradoxical relationship between education and business (see also McMurtry 2004,

2010). McMurtry argues that the defining principles of education and the market – including their goals, motivations, methods and standards of excellence – are not only distinct, they are deeply contradictory. The market’s preoccupation with proprietary rights, private-want satisfaction, the manipulation of intellect and ready-made product lines are necessarily opposed to education’s emphasis on knowledge sharing, autonomous learning, critical thinking and intellectual depth. In short, one cannot be understood in terms of the principles of the other. It follows that business leaders do not have the right competencies to enter into “partnerships” with institutions of higher learning or to dictate their priorities. According to McMurtry, to prevent the encroachment of corporatization into higher education, we must recognize that these two spheres are fundamentally, and irreconcilably, opposed.

The deep opposition between corporations and universities has also been analyzed by Henry Rosolvky, who describes the growing entanglement of these institutions as “against nature” (cited in Duderstadt 2004: 72). Similarly, Howard Woodhouse (1988: 14) characterizes the differences between universities and business firms as “profound and indubitable.” He argues that the “production and transmission of knowledge for the purpose of truth-seeking, communication and criticism differs drastically from the production and distribution of commodities for the purpose of profit.” Others like Bart Giamatti – onetime commissioner of Major League Baseball and former president of Yale University – are more precise in describing how the goals and principles of universities and corporations diverge:

A college or university is an institution where financial incentives to excellence are absent, where the product line is not a unit or an object but rather a value-laden and life-long process; where the goal of the enterprise is

not growth or market share but intellectual excellence; not profit or proprietary rights but the free good of knowledge; not efficiency of operation but equity of treatment; not increased productivity in economic terms but increased intensity of thinking about who we are and how we live and about the world around us (cited in Tanguay 2003: 50-51).

Critics of corporatization have focused much of their attention on the threat it poses to academic freedom. Consistent with broader critiques of corporate-university linkages, here opponents also highlight the fundamental differences between corporate and academic institutions. Tudiver (1999), for one, claims that academic freedom is incompatible with corporatization because it exists to protect professors from the influence of the market. For Tudiver, the freedom to dictate the terms and conditions of one's scholarship conflicts sharply with corporate priorities that define academic productivity in pecuniary terms. Similarly, historian Michael Katz (1986: 20) argues that tenure and academic freedom are the "great barriers to the total victory of the marketplace" because they restrict the operation of free wage labour, which reduces the conversion of faculty into commodities. Along these same lines, Krinsky (2003: 223) claims that the corporatization of the university threatens to turn academic freedom into an anachronism. What is the value of academic freedom, he asks, in a culture where "[b]oldness' means taking business risks ... 'Adventurous' means marketing an unusual product ... Academic entrepreneurs behave differently than public intellectuals."

This institutional mismatch is also evident in the other features of corporatization documented throughout this study. For one, it is routinely argued that universities have been made more efficient through the introduction of greater market competition and corporate management. If the goal is to increase private sponsorships or boost university brands, then arguably they have. However, if the goal is to use limited public resources to

serve public ends, then corporatization is markedly inefficient. In fact, it has contributed to universities wasting public resources in a variety of ways, including; bidding wars for “research stars;” expensive public relations campaigns; costly expenditures in the pursuit of external research grants; and the use of consultants for marketing and hiring purposes. Additionally, the increase in both the size and cost of administrative bureaucracies (much of it devoted to non-academic purposes) has been a significant drain on public resources. For programs and departments, market “efficiency” has translated into funding disparities and reduced support for less profitable academic units. For students, efficiency has been associated with larger class sizes and a diminished (and more expensive) educational experience. And for faculty, efficiency has led to academic deskilling, reductions in collegial governance and the substitution of contract labour for the labour of full-time professors.

The incompatible relationship between education and business is also evident in the transformation of students into educational consumers. As discussed in Chapter 6, the student-consumer identity is paradoxical because customer-supplier and student-university relationships are, in principle, contradictory. Just as educational “services” are different from other services, the normative expectations, rights and obligations of students differ from those of traditional customers. In the words of James Turk (2000: 12), “[r]eal education has no ‘products,’ no ‘clients,’ no ‘raw material,’ no ‘customers.’” The same incompatibility exists in the area of research, where corporate-university conflict is exemplified by the differences between academic and industrial science. As detailed in Chapter 8, the ideals of academic research centre on disinterested inquiry and knowledge sharing, whereas industrial science tends to be motivated by financial gain

and encourage research secrecy. Likewise, academic research relies on peer review and the replicability of results, whereas industrial research does not involve the same verification process. Moreover, the goal of academic research is to advance public knowledge, whereas industrial research aims to produce proprietary knowledge or a product that succeeds in the marketplace. Finally, neither institution has yet to succeed when they step outside of their respective basic functions. Corporations are poor performers when it comes to knowledge sharing and research integrity, and universities are equally inept when it comes to venture capitalism and generating revenue from commercialized research.

In sum, the social and institutional roles of the university often place it in opposition to the values and objectives of the corporate sector. These persistent sources of tension – between public service and profit making, “efficiency” and equity, liberal learning and vocational training, consumerism and education, and critical research and commercial invention – reflect deeply-rooted institutional differences.

Implications: The Need for Radical Reform

Clearly, regulatory strategies and reforms will not ever represent a real challenge to the corporatization of higher education. More radical solutions are required in order to bring about substantive change. In what follows, I review what such a radical vision could look like in the areas of the university that have been most affected by corporatization: governance, research and the casualization of academic labour.

In the area of university governance, a more radical and effective response to corporatization would be to challenge the legitimacy of managerialism. Strategies to reform or improve corporate management are limited in what they can achieve, and may

even exacerbate the problems that they are trying to solve. Subjecting administrations to greater monitoring and oversight, or pushing for the construction of “better” accountability measures only legitimizes the corporate notion of accountability. Similarly, initiatives aimed at improving the stock of university administrators (e.g., by getting more academics into executive positions) do little to influence how universities function (just as “progressive” business managers do little to influence how large corporations function). What is needed is to challenge the basic prerogatives of corporate management and construct concrete alternatives. As Polster (2011: 151) explains,

all strategies must focus directly on transforming university relations, rather than on reforming university administrations . . . instead of lobbying for ‘enlightened’ administrators who are respectful of academic traditions, one would seek to transform the criteria and processes through which university resources are allocated. Likewise, instead of convincing managers to employ more appropriate indicators when evaluating academics’ performance, one would challenge the very use of performance indicators and promote more flexible, sophisticated and helpful means of assessing and supporting academic work.

In short, corporate management *itself* is the problem; its baseline assumptions and practices are fundamentally at odds with effective governance in a university setting.

Similar arguments can be made about how to address current problems in university research. Reformist approaches call for clear rules and guidelines for “managing” the innumerable conflicts of interest involved in corporate-university alliances and regulating the contracts between researchers and business firms. To date, these strategies have proven woefully ineffective. One reason for this, as noted by Arthur Schafer (2008: 69), is that corporate-university partnerships are almost “preordained” to produce research findings that favour the interests of business. In other words, the proprietary interests of corporations routinely win out over academic honesty and integrity, so much so that these

partnerships cannot be effectively managed. Like Schafer (2004, 2008), I would argue that an effective, long-term solution for addressing these problems would be an outright prohibition on corporate research funding, at least in those disciplines where the potential for harm is high. Critics of this strategy claim that denying corporate grants on moral grounds is a slippery slope that violates academic freedom, discourages valuable academic work and aggravates the funding crisis in higher education. However, so long as faculty are not prohibited from (or penalized for) speaking, writing, teaching or researching about a particular topic, restricting a funding source does not violate academic freedom. As Krimsky (2008) explains, academic freedom “is not extinguished in the case that a university community takes responsible and transparent collective action, following accepted governance procedures, that prohibits certain funding from entering the university” (p. 94). This is not to suggest that other kinds of sponsored research funding never results in problems, or that all corporate money is detrimental. The influx of private funding for applied research has, in some instances, accelerated scientific progress to an extent that would not have been possible without such support. Nevertheless, the harms that result from corporate funding and influence far outweigh these benefits.²³⁷ Not only that, but when the financial costs of participating in corporate research alliances are taken into account, the monetary implications of cutting these ties for universities would be far less than is commonly assumed.

²³⁷ I would contend that that even if corporate sponsored research did not lead to the problems noted in this study, there is still an argument for reducing or eliminating corporate funding and partnerships within a university setting. Through these alliances, corporations are able to buy access to the university’s source credibility and accrue “decency by association” by aligning themselves with academic researchers. Private sources of economic power (especially those engaged in destructive social and environmental practices) have no right to appropriate the institutional integrity that university institutions have built up over centuries.

It is important to note that there has been some movement in this direction. Some medical schools have restricted ties between drug companies and physicians and eliminated industry support for continuing medical education. Medical journals have also made some progress. The journal *Open Medicine*, for example, was formed in 2007 by former editors of the *Canadian Medical Association Journal* who resigned from their positions in part due to corporate threats to their editorial autonomy. The journal publishes its material freely online, has completely banned all pharmaceutical and medical device advertising, and has strict rules to prevent ghost-writing (see Willinsky et al. 2007). These kinds of advances have since continued. In 2009, a collection of editors from the world's leading medical journals openly called for "a complete ban on pharmaceutical and medical device industry funding" to professional medical associations (Rothman et al. 2009: 1368). Drawing attention to the corrosive influence of corporate funding on medical science, these experts argued that "fundamental reforms" were required of medical organizations and academic medical centres in order to protect scientific integrity, patients and "the public's trust" (p. 1372).

Turning to academic labour, similar radical solutions are required to address the impacts of corporatization. One of the greatest challenges in this context is balancing the immediate interests of contract faculty with the long-term interests of the academic profession as a whole. On the one hand, some progress has been made in improving the lives and working conditions of contract faculty in Canada. The last two decades have seen a wave of union organizing by contingent academics; there are now relatively few faculty members in Canada who do not belong to a union. Some unions have succeeded in securing contract workers partial access to governance, such as committee

participation and departmental voting rights. Other small inequities have been addressed in the area of institutional support, including greater access to conference travel and professional development allowances. A few faculty associations now link per course pay to percentages of permanent salaries (a key element of a pro-rata model), while others have negotiated sabbaticals for long-term employees. Finally, a large number of departments have “regularized” one or more of their contract positions, providing full-time status, greater job security as well access to pensions and other benefits.

On the other hand, the efficacy of focusing on piecemeal improvements for contract staff and/or “regularized” positions remains in question. Semi-permanent or full-time contract appointments are not the first choice of employment for most academics, and they do not offer an adequate solution to the problems associated with contract work that were detailed in Chapter 4. Moreover, the majority of faculty are opposed to the separation of teaching and research (see OCUFA 2012c), which necessarily takes place with contract and other teaching stream positions. At a broader level, it is important to note that casualization in the academy is connected to a long-term strategy to transform the nature of academic work. As such, universities are systematically (and unnecessarily) under-producing quality jobs, and contract positions are being created where tenure stream positions can and should exist. This strongly suggests that solutions should be focused on demanding more tenure track appointments.

While I would not go so far as to say that we should abandon the goal of improving the conditions of contract work, we need to devise strategies that improve working conditions at the same time as challenging the broader casualization process. If not, we risk institutionalizing casualization as a permanent feature of the academy and providing

an official status to the academic underclass. There are a number of ways that this dual goal might be achieved. One would be to change the nature of academic labour organizing. As it currently stands, the labour movement has not succeeded in halting or reversing the move toward casualization. In fact, some claim that unionization has actually increased casualization because the majority of unions and faculty associations are focused on protecting the interests of existing tenure stream faculty, interests that are often at odds with those of contract staff (Dobbie and Robinson 2008). A counter-measure might involve organizing non-tenure track and permanent faculty into the same bargaining units in order to push for more radical solutions to problems that are sector-wide. A key challenge would be to support permanent faculty to see the necessity of solidarity across all segments of academic (and non-academic) labour at the organizational level. Until such alliances can be institutionalized, contract faculty need to strengthen their own organizational capacity at the regional, national and international levels, through organizations like the Coalition of Contingent Academic Employment.²³⁸

To conclude, none of this is to suggest that universities should abandon applied research or “practical” education. The public continues to expect universities to find solutions to real world problems and teach people how to make a living within current institutional arrangements. In fact, a “pure” university divorced from “useful” education and research is not the desired end goal. As discussed in the Chapter 6, scholars like Mills, Russell and Dewey argued for the progressive integration of liberal education and skills training, in part, because they believed that universities should be involved in contemporary issues and struggles. In other words, universities fail when they confine

²³⁸ For a useful discussion of contract faculty organizing in the US, see Berry (2005).

themselves to isolated “ivory tower” pursuits. However, these tasks do not require universities to integrate themselves with corporations or behave like corporations. As argued throughout this section, this integration is problematic because of the fundamental incompatibility between university and corporate institutions. Corporatization cannot be accommodated, reformed or managed; radical programs of internal restructuring and institutional separation are required to effect change in the long-term. While many dismiss such proposals as unrealistic, especially the idea that the linkages between universities and corporations could be significantly reduced, we are already seeing progress in this direction. Furthermore, the fact remains that these relationships threaten many of the defining characteristics of higher education. Several years ago, Noam Chomsky was asked whether a healthy and equitable relationship between universities and corporations was possible. He responded as follows:

Suppose we think of a society run by a dictator, or a slave society. You could ask how a more ‘healthy and equitable relationship’ might exist between the dictator or slave owner and his subjects. The answer would be that the rulers could become more benevolent, or might be compelled to yield to the demands of their subjects in some respects. Within the framework of the institutions, it makes sense to press for greater benevolence. But the more fundamental question, plainly, is different. Is the institutional relationship legitimate? Should it survive? I think the same kinds of considerations arise here. Within the given institutional framework, it makes sense to pressure private power to be more forthcoming; in this case, to allow universities more opportunities to pursue free and unconstrained inquiry, both in teaching and research programs, even if the educational and research programs tend to undermine existing structures of power, as I personally think they would, if they are truly free. The more such goals are achieved, the healthier is the relationship. But there are plainly going to be limits, and the fundamental question of legitimacy remains (cited in White 2000: 452).

Intersectoral Alliances

In Canada today, universities are simply one target, albeit an important one, of corporate/political forces that are attempting to change the culture of the public sphere and expand their impact on the general population. In this way, the problems confronting universities are akin to the problems facing other institutions and of Canadian society more broadly. As intellectual and activist Ursula Franklin (2000: 21) explains, corporatization is “not so much a university problem, but the university manifestation of a general, technologically-facilitated shift of power and accountability. The impact of this new misdistribution of power is felt in many other public institutions in Canada.” It follows that efforts to transform universities are inextricably linked to struggles to democratize social, political and economic life. As noted above, one of the key factors for opposing educational reform is the extent to which these efforts are connected to broader social movements operating outside of the university. In this section, I briefly review efforts by students – in Canada and worldwide – and the role of intellectuals in challenging corporatization and connecting with these larger movements.

Recent Developments in the Student Movement

In the 1980s and 1990s, there was a general lack of student organizing. In many countries around the world, there is now a renewed sense of commitment. This shift is evidenced by an increase in the level of student participation, the use of more militant tactics (such as occupations) and the creation of linkages with broader social movements. Student unrest has focused on a number of issues, including educational restructuring. In the past few years alone, students in California engaged in a mass walk-out and a series of occupations across the entire University of California system; massive student

demonstrations in the UK were followed by a wave of occupations that spread to dozens of universities in England; students and educators in Italy organized against public disinvestment by occupying campuses, train stations, highways and airports; students in Austria occupied classrooms and offices for an entire semester in defiance of financing reforms; and in Greece hundreds of schools and university departments came under student occupation as the government faced mounting opposition to its higher education agenda. Students have also launched large and coordinated resistance campaigns in Germany, France, Denmark, Spain, the Netherlands, Finland, Columbia, Croatia, Argentina, the Philippines, Taiwan and Canada.

As noted in the opening chapter, what is particularly striking about many student movements today is that their participants are locating educational concerns within the larger context of government austerity agendas, attacks on worker rights, declining social programs, ecological devastation and the expansion of corporate power. These developments are indicative of some of the new intersectoral alliances that are beginning to form among university-based and other social movements. In Chile, for example, hundreds of thousands of students began a series of mass demonstrations in 2011 against tuition increases. Over the next few years, this initial upheaval progressed into a broad-based movement composed of students, academics, teachers and workers unions, civil servants and human rights organizations. As the diversity of its participants grew, the movement began to challenge other issues, including class inequality, health care privatization, environmental destruction, the Chilean constitution, the activities of foreign mining companies and even the basic structure of the capitalist economy (Bernasconi 2012; Larrabure and Torchia 2011; Lavars 2012). A similar series of events recently took

place in Puerto Rico, where educational disinvestment led to protests, mass strikes and occupations in 2010-11. This student-based movement received broad public support from religious organizations, community and professional associations and labour unions, and quickly evolved into a nation-wide struggle against privatization, unemployment and cuts to public services (Rodriguez 2011).

Of course, there is also evidence of these kinds of alliances in the Canadian context. The 2012 Quebec student strikes, which began as a series of actions opposing planned tuition increases, evolved into something far more significant. One major branch of the movement – represented by the Coalition large de l'Association pour une solidarité syndicale étudiante (CLASSE) – consisted of students who located the tuition hikes as part of a broader neoliberal program. Accordingly, they held general assemblies, organized alternative education events and built alliances with outside organizations. According to Ingar Solty (2012), the success of the student strikes rested upon the solidarity and support the movement received from the “Red-Hand-Coalition” – an alliance of 125 organizations including anti-poverty groups, environmental groups and public sector unions that formed in 2009 to resist privatization and neoliberal restructuring. The students also received widespread support from teachers, parents and university professors in part because of the broad social and political mandate the movement had come to represent.

That students in Chile, Puerto Rico, Canada and numerous other countries are explicitly linking the state of public education to larger issues of neoliberalism, class inequality and attacks on the public sector is an important development. It highlights that, despite efforts to render corporate influences invisible or explain them in positive terms,

students are aware of the current threat they pose to higher education and the wider society. It also demonstrates the new forms of solidarity that are beginning to emerge across social movements. In many respects, student organizing against educational restructuring and broader sociopolitical developments is at the forefront of issues that the wider society is going to have to confront in the years ahead.

The Role of Intellectuals in Opposing Corporatization

As noted in previous chapters, corporatization has not simply been imposed on universities from the outside or forced on faculty from above. Politicians and administrators do not send out edicts that bind or require faculty to alter their teaching and research agendas, or submit to greater monitoring and “accountability.” While it is important to understand the role and power of the corporate elite in ushering in these changes, the academic community has also played a role, even if it is largely a complicit one, in the corporatization process. The participation of faculty in challenging this process is essential yet, with few exceptions, they have not put forward an alternative program.

In my view, if academics are going to push back against corporatization, they need to recognize the limitations of “radical scholarship.” A large amount of critical research and writing is never read by anyone except other academics, and “political battles” in the scholastic universe are limited in what they can achieve. Moreover, academics need to recognize the limitations of confining their audience to politicians or university administrators. As Chomsky has argued, “speaking truth to power” is not a particularly effective or honourable vocation. Those who exercise power in coercive institutions already know the truth, for the most part, and even if they can be swayed by intellectual

analyses or moral arguments, they remain constrained by institutional imperatives. Rather, intellectuals should “seek out an audience that matters;” namely, groups that are able and willing to oppose corporatization in higher education and elsewhere (Chomsky 1997: 61). Further, “it should not be seen as an audience, but as a community of common concern in which one hopes to participate constructively. We should not be speaking *to*, but *with*.”

Like students, then, faculty should step outside of the ivory tower and forge alliances with broader social movements. Within this context, intellectuals can make important contributions by providing information and analysis to popular movements. Their high level of workplace autonomy and access to resources also means that they have the potential to be effective organizers. There are two concrete, relatively simple ways, to forge these partnerships. First, faculty members can bring activists and community leaders into the university to participate in study programs on urban problems, environmental decay, alternative food systems, educational restructuring, corporate crime and other issues. They could even involve outside participants more directly by putting these programs into the hands of communities themselves. An example of this kind of initiative is the Labor and Working Class Studies Project at University of Wisconsin, which is a collaboration of academics, organized labour and community activists that connects the university and the community in dialogue and action on labour related issues.²³⁹ Second, intellectuals can “take the university” into the wider society by encouraging students to get practically involved with groups working

²³⁹ Also in Wisconsin, academics recently joined with students, public sector workers and union activists to bring attention to unprecedented attacks on public institutions and union rights by the Republican state government.

for social change. In 2012, Columbia University began offering an “Occupy Wall Street” course in which students could earn full course credits by getting involved in the movement’s projects outside of the classroom. In Canada, there have also been promising efforts to align university teachers, students, citizens and social movements into programs of liberatory education. In the early 2000s, for instance, the People’s Free University of Saskatchewan (PFU) began offering a wide variety of courses to members of the public. Many of those involved with the PFU worked and studied at the University of Saskatchewan. PFU incorporated a democratic and inclusive community-based model of education that combined practical and theoretical subjects (see Woodhouse 2009). Toronto’s “Anarchist University” (Antliff 2007) and “Critical U” in Vancouver (Coté, Day and de 2007) are other notable examples of community-based education projects that have created alliances between formal education systems and movements of civil society.²⁴⁰

Universities in Canada and elsewhere remain heavily dependent on external power. The major institutions in capitalist society would never tolerate (and could easily thwart) radical educational reforms that are isolated from broader struggles. Further, the use of universities to sort individuals into occupational hierarchies and support capitalist objectives has become so deeply rooted under neoliberalism that it could not be altered without a more thorough social and political transformation. It is for this reason that connecting educational struggles with broader movements of civil society is critical for

²⁴⁰ Today’s movements could learn from the US Intercollegiate Socialist Society (ISS) of the early twentieth century, which forged important alliances between the academy and movements for industrial democracy. Founded in New York by Jack London and Upton Sinclair in 1905, the ISS was an “organizational bridge between the labor movement, working-class intellectuals, and traditional intellectuals in the university” (Barrow 1990: 178). Between 1910 and 1917, approximately 20 percent of all four-year colleges and universities in the US had an official ISS chapter affiliated with the national movement.

students and intellectuals. Ironically, the corporatization of the university has created additional space for these necessary alliances to grow. As Nick Dyer-Witheford (2007: 52) explains:

The revolts of forty years ago were resisting capital's tendency to make the university a 'knowledge factory.' But because this assimilation was only partially complete, these uprising had a certain isolation ... Today, the much tighter fusion of academia with business, and the manifest subordination of education to the job market has ended this relative isolation and has opened other possibilities. The conventional distinction between university and the 'real world' – at once self-deprecating and self-protective – is becoming less and less relevant. If students and teachers have lost some of the latitude of action and relative privilege that universities once afforded, they have also become connected to and potential participants in movements outside the university.

Relevance Revisited

There is general acceptance that the university plays a “relevant” role in the lives of people and communities and in society at large, but there are differences in how this concept of relevance is understood. Some see universities as relevant to the extent that they prepare people for employment in the capitalist economy and support economic competitiveness. Others view relevance in terms of intellectual inquiry for its own sake, where knowledge acquisition and scholarly engagement are meaningful in and of themselves. Still others locate the university's relevance in its ongoing contributions to social justice and social change. As I have discussed throughout this work, “relevance” under corporatization has largely become a euphemism for service to the state and to the market. And there are many problems with limiting the university's role in this way. As Poster and Newson (2009: 34) argue in their work: “Not only does this narrow universities' actual relevance in the present, but it also limits their potential relevance in

the future. For, as universities respond more and more to the economic needs of corporations, service to business becomes institutionalized, and the flexibility that allows universities to be relevant to new, more diverse needs as they arise is reduced.”

These diverse needs include various issues of human and social concern. Today, the most pressing of these include the need for universities to engage in protecting biological diversity; tackling poverty, hunger and malnutrition; reducing the threat of nuclear war; rebuilding economies devastated by neoliberal policies; halting the poisoning of our land, air and water; and mitigating the potentially disastrous effects of climate change. The causes of these complex, and often related, challenges are rooted in society’s major institutions and structures of power. Therefore, it is vital that these institutions and their supporting ideologies be subject to critical analysis, and, ultimately, to direct challenge. Universities should be an object of such analysis and, just as importantly, they should provide a venue – an institutional position of authority and influence – within and through which this analysis and activism takes place. It is this definition of “relevance” – emphasizing the university’s role in social transformation – that principally motivated my study of corporatization in the current period. It was also the entry point for student protests in the 1960s, which emphasized that insofar as the “ivory tower” meant isolation from or a refusal to engage with critical social issues, it played a largely irrelevant role. According to Students for a Democratic Society’s (1962) activists:

[T]he university is located in a permanent position of social influence. Its educational function makes it indispensable and automatically makes it a crucial institution in the formation of social attitudes ... in an unbelievably complicated world, it is the central institution for organizing, evaluating, and transmitting knowledge ... the university is the only mainstream institution that is open to participation by individuals of nearly every viewpoint ... these

together make the university a potential base and agency in a movement of social change.

As these students recognized, and as many students and educators recognize today, there is something distinctive about the university that cannot be found elsewhere in society. The university's subversive function and its commitment to the development of new social visions is why universities have always been connected with broader movements for change. As Simon Marginson (2011: 419) points out, in the past half century the university has been implicated in "the civil rights movement, 1960s-1970s student power and grass-roots democracy, 1970s feminism, gay liberation, anti-nuclear and pro-ecology movements, and the 1990s-2000s anti-globalisation protests against global injustice, corporate power and violations of national sovereignty." To this list one could add the international movement against climate change, Occupy Wall Street and countless other democratization struggles taking place around the world. These and the upcoming challenges and problems facing humanity are of such a magnitude that universities will only be relevant to the extent that they provide an institutional forum in which to challenge current social and economic arrangements. It is for this reason that university reform is largely insignificant except as it contributes to social change, and that more radical measures are required to challenge corporatization in partnership with broader social justice efforts.

Appendix A

Characterizations of Modern Universities

- ***The Corporate University***: A broad concept that refers to private, for-profit universities and non-profit (usually public) institutions which increasingly operate like for-profit firms. In the case of non-profit institutions, the corporate university accentuates many of the features of the corporatization process, including the university's enhanced revenue-generating capacity, the infusion of corporate values into higher education, the commercialization of academic research and the presence of managerial and academic labour practices that resemble those of private companies (e.g., Aronowitz 2000; Côté and Allahar 2011; Donoghue 2008; Johnson, Kavanagh and Mattson 2003; **Tuchman 2009**; **Tudiver 1999**).
- ***The Entrepreneurial University***: Popularized by the work of Burton Clarke (1998), the entrepreneurial university concept incorporates a wide international literature that addresses both the causes (e.g., reductions in public funding, "innovation" agendas and economic competition) and the consequences (e.g., market-led curriculum reform and the expansion of university-state-corporate research ties) of university restructuring. Many of the most prominent studies on the entrepreneurial university analyze institutional/academic entrepreneurship in the areas of intellectual property and technology transfer (e.g., Etzkowitz 2004; Etzkowitz, Webster and Healy 1998). For an overview, see Gibb, Haskins and Robertson (2009).
- ***The Enterprise University***: Focusing on university restructuring in Australia, the work of Simon Marginson and Mark Considine (2000) on the enterprise university highlights the process whereby university missions and governing bodies assume a distinctly corporate character. As part of this process, universities are defined by strong executive control and managerial governance, with an emphasis on marketing, performance targets and greater competition for resources.
- ***The Service University***: Within the service university paradigm, the delivery of contract research and instructional/training programs are designed to satisfy the needs of external clients, most notably those in the corporate sector. Internally, service-oriented fields and applied/commercial disciplines are prioritized over the university's traditional emphasis on the liberal arts and sciences (Buchbinder 1993; Cummings 1998, 1999; Newson and Buchbinder 1988).

- ***The Exchange University***: The concept of the exchange university locates corporatization as the extension of market ideology and market relations into higher education. Here, research products, educational credentials and even knowledge itself become commodities valued more for their “exchange” value than their “use” value (Chan and Fisher 2008).
- ***The Hybrid University***: Framed within the context of reduced public funding, the concept of the hybrid university is used to describe institutions that receive a substantial (and growing) portion of their income from private sources, including student fees, corporate sponsorships and contract research. The term also highlights strategies used by university managers to facilitate a “successful” coexistence of traditional academic and modern market cultures (Mouwens 2000).
- ***The Innovative University***: The notion of the innovative university is centered on the idea that traditional models of higher education are unsustainable and that modern universities must find less costly ways of performing their unique functions. The emphasis is on new institutional strategies driven by information technology and online and distance education. Curriculum specialization and reformed systems of tenure and promotion are also features of the innovative university (Christensen and Eyring 2011).
- ***The McUniversity***: This concept refers to universities that rely more on quantifiable measures – such as standardized instruction, performance indicators and institutional rankings – as markers of “quality” and “efficiency.” In these configurations, cost accounting principles redefine the meaning and purpose of higher education along corporate lines, and administrators and students adopt a more consumer-driven orientation to higher learning (Rinne 1999; Ritzer, 2002).

Appendix B Faculties

University	Data Requested
York University	Faculty of Liberal Arts & Professional Studies
University of Toronto	Faculty of Arts & Science (main campus)
Carleton University	Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
University of Ottawa	Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Guelph	College of Arts and College of Social & Applied Human Sciences
Brock University	Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Social Sciences
Queen's University	Faculty of Arts & Sciences
University of Waterloo	Faculty of Arts
Ryerson University	Faculty of Arts
University of Western Ontario	Faculty of Arts & Humanities and Faculty of Social Science
University of Windsor	Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
McMaster University	Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Social Sciences
Lakehead University	Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities
Laurentian University	Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities (main campus)
Nipissing University	Faculty of Arts & Science (main campus)
Wilfrid Laurier University	Faculty of Arts (main campus)
Trent University	Select Departments
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	All Faculties

Appendix C

Fee Estimates, Fee Waivers and Costs*

University	Estimated Fee	Fee Waiver	Payment
York University	\$0	n/a	\$0
University of Toronto	\$150.00	no	\$150.00
Carleton University	\$450.00	n/a**	\$0
University of Ottawa (1 st Request)	\$90.00	no	\$90.00
University of Ottawa (2 nd Request)	\$900.40	yes	\$0
University of Guelph	\$0	n/a	\$0
Brock University	\$315.00	partial	\$195.00
Queen's University	\$450.00	partial	\$150.00
University of Waterloo	\$0	n/a	\$0
Ryerson University	\$150.00	no	\$150.00
University of Western Ontario	\$120.00	no	\$120.00
University of Windsor	\$90.00	yes	\$0
McMaster University	\$1381.80	yes	\$0
Lakehead University	\$0	n/a	\$0
Laurentian University	\$200.00	yes	\$0
Nipissing University	\$0	n/a	\$0
Wilfrid Laurier University	\$160.00	partial	\$75.00
Trent University	\$0	n/a	\$0
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	\$0	n/a	\$0

* Seven universities supplied me with the data free of charge. The others produced a fee estimate that reflected the labour costs associated with the request. In most cases where a fee estimate was provided, I applied for a fee waiver under section 57 (4) of the FIPPA on the grounds of financial hardship. I received full fee waivers from Windsor, McMaster, Laurentian and Ottawa (second request). I also received partial waivers from Brock, Queen's and Wilfred Laurier. In the end, I made payments to seven universities, totaling \$930.00.

** Although the Carleton administration initially provided me with a large fee estimate, it did not insist on payment and therefore a formal waiver application was not required.

Appendix D Information Timeframe

University	Start Date	End Date	Timeframe*
York University	February 2010	April 2011	14 months
University of Toronto	February 2010	April 2010	2 months
Carleton University	February 2010	June 2010	4 months
University of Ottawa (1 st)	February 2010	April 2010	2 months
Guelph University	April 2010	June 2010	2 months
Brock University	April 2010	August 2010	4 months
Queen's University	April 2010	July 2010	3 months
University of Waterloo	June 2010	July 2010	1 month
Ryerson University	June 2010	December 2010	6 months
University of Western Ontario	June 2010	October 2010	4 months
University of Windsor	June 2010	October 2010	4 months
McMaster University	June 2010	September 2011	15 months
Lakehead University	September 2010	July 2011	10 months
Laurentian University	September 2010	August 2011	11 months
Nipissing University	September 2010	October 2010	1 month
Wilfrid Laurier University	September 2010	June 2011	9 months
Trent University	September 2010	November 2010	2 months
University of Ontario Institute of Technology	September 2010	January 2011	4 months
University of Ottawa (2 nd)**	March 2011	June 2011	3 months

* Sometimes data errors and omissions were discovered late in the process and arrangements were made to procure revised data as they became available. As a result, updated or modified data was received from several institutions between 2011 and 2013, which is not reflected in the information timelines.

** A second request was sent to the University of Ottawa in 2011 in order to secure additional information on part-time faculty.

References

- Abaya, Eleanor. 2008. "Marketing Universities is a Modern-Day Necessity." *University Affairs*, August 5.
- Abraham, Matthew. 2011. "The Question of Palestine and the Subversion of Academic Freedom: DePaul's Denial of Tenure to Norman Finkelstein." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 33 (3/4): 179-203.
- Adendorff, Lee. 2010. "Mass Protests Against 'Cuts' and Reforms." *University World News*, 148 November 18.
- Advisory Panel on Canada's International Education Strategy. 2012. "International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity." Ottawa: Minister of International Trade.
- Allen, Kate. 2013. "National Research Council 'Open for Business,' Conservative Government Says." *Toronto Star*, May 7.
- Allmand, Warren. 1981. *Work for Tomorrow: Employment Opportunities for the 1980s*. Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Altbach, Philip. 2013. "The Global Brain Race – Robbing Developing Countries." *University World News* 268, April 20.
- _____. 2004. "Globalisation and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World." *Tertiary Education and Management* 10 (1): 3-25.
- Altbach, Philip, Liz Reisberg and Laura Rumbley. 2009. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- American Association of University Professors. 2010. "Selected References on Contingent Faculty and Student Success." At <aacu.org/meetings/annualmeeting/AM10/documents/AAUPHandout.pdf>
- _____. 2003. "Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession." At <aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/conting-stmt.htm>
- Anderson, Erin. 2012. "Can Canada's Schools Pass the Next Great Intelligence Test?" *Globe and Mail*, October 5.
- Andrews, Bruce. 1976. *Public Constraint and American Policy in Vietnam*. California: Sage.

- Angulo, Fernando, Alben Pergelova and Josep Rialp. 2010. "A Market Segmentation Approach for Higher Education Based on Rational and Emotional Factors." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 20 (1): 1-17.
- Angus, Ian. 2009. *Love the Questions: University Education and Enlightenment*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Anisef, Paul, Paul Axelrod and Zeng Lin. 1999. "Universities, Liberal Education, and the Labour Market: Trends and Prospects." York University: Centre for Research on Work and Society.
- Annis, Roger. 2012. "Government Repression of Quebec Student Movement Sparks Massive Protest." *The Bullet, Socialist Project E-Bulletin* No. 641, May 28.
- Antliff, Alan. 2007. "Breaking Free: Anarchist Pedagogy." In M. Coté, R. Day and G. de Peuter (eds.), *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Apple, Michael. 2000. "Between Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context." In N. Burbules and C. Torres (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. 2001. *The Last Good Job in America: Work and Education in the New Global Technoculture*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- _____. 2000. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Arsenault, Chris. 2007. *A New Paradigm for Paying the Piper: Access, Control and Commercialization at Halifax Universities*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Public Interest Research Group.
- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. 2012. "Back to School Quick Facts." Ottawa.
- _____. 2011a. *Trends in Higher Education: Volume 1 – Enrolment*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2011b. "Statement on Academic Freedom." At <aucc.ca/media-room/news-and-commentary/canadas-universities-adopt-new-statement-on-academic-freedom>

- _____. 2011c. "The Revitalization of Undergraduate Education in Canada." Ottawa.
- _____. 2010a. "Value of a Degree in Canada's Labour Market." Ottawa.
- _____. 2010b. "The Value of a University Degree." Ottawa.
- _____. 2010c. "Value of a Degree in a Global Marketplace." Ottawa.
- _____. 2009a. "International Research Collaboration." Ottawa.
- _____. 2009b. "Universities Matter: How Canada's Universities Contribute to Economic Recovery and Long-Term Prosperity." Ottawa.
- _____. 2008a. *Trends in Higher Education: Volume 3 – Finance*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2008b. "Internationalization: A Force for Change at Canadian Universities." Ottawa.
- _____. 2008c. *Momentum: The 2008 Report on University Research and Knowledge Mobilization*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2007a. *Trends in Higher Education: Volume 2 – Faculty*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2007b. "Canadian Universities and International Student Mobility." Ottawa.
- _____. 2002a. "Framework of Agreed Principles on Federally Funded University Research." Ottawa.
- _____. 2002b. *Trends in Higher Education*. Ottawa.
- Association of Part-Time Professors of the University of Ottawa. 2011. "Rocky Road Ahead for Canada's University's Part-Time Professors." At <APTPUO-PrRel-20110426-main.pdf>
- Astin, Alexander. 2000. *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 2000*. California: American Council on Education.
- _____. 1998. "The Changing American College Student: Thirty-Year Trends, 1966-1996." *The Review of Higher Education* 21 (2): 115-135.
- Atkinson-Grosjean, Janet. 2006. *Public Science, Private Interests: Culture and Commerce in Canada's Networks of Centres of Excellence*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Atkinson-Grosjean, Janet and Cory Fairly. 2009. "Moral Economies in Science: From Ideal to Pragmatic." *Minerva* 47 (2): 147-170.
- Attaran, Amir. 2008. "When Think Tanks Produce Propaganda." *Globe and Mail*, February 21.
- Axelrod, Paul. 2008. "Public Policy in Ontario Higher Education: From Frost to Harris." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- _____. 2002. *Values in Conflict: The University, the Marketplace, and the Trials of Liberal Education*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- _____. 1998. "Challenges to Liberal Education in an Age of Uncertainty." *Historical Studies in Education* 10 (1/2): 1-19.
- _____. 1986. "Service or Captivity? Business-University Relations in the Twentieth Century." In W. Neilson and C. Gaffield (eds.), *Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty-First Century*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- _____. 1982a. *Scholars and Dollars: Politics, Economics, and the Universities of Ontario 1945-1980*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 1982b. "Businessmen and the Building of Canadian Universities: A Case Study." *Canadian Historical Review* 68 (2): 202-222.
- _____. 1980-81. "Business Aid to Canadian Universities – 1957-1965." *Interchange* 11 (1): 25-38.
- Bagué, Edurne, Núria Comerma and Ignasi Terradas. 2010. "An Analytical Proposal for Understanding the 'Higher Education European Space': A View from the University of Barcelona." *New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry* 3 (2): 9-19.
- Barkans, John and Norene Pupo. 1978. "Canadian Universities and the Economic Order." In R. Nelsen and D. Nock (eds.), *Reading, Writing, and Riches: Education and the Socio-Economic Order in North America*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- _____. 1974. "The Board of Governors and the Power Elite: A Case Study of Eight Canadian Universities." *Sociological Focus* 7 (3).
- Barlow, Maude and Heather-Jane Robertson. 1994. *Class Warfare: The Assault on Canada's Schools*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

- Barnes, Deborah and Lisa Bero. 1998. "Why Review Articles on the Health Effects of Passive Smoking Reach Different Conclusions." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 279 (19): 1566-1570.
- Barnetson, Bob and Alice Boberg. 2000. "Resource Allocation and Public Policy in Alberta's Postsecondary System." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 30 (2): 57-86.
- Barrett, David. 2011. "The Cheating Epidemic at Britain's Universities." *The Telegraph*, March 5.
- Barrow, Clyde. 1990. *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894-1928*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barr-Telford, Lynn, Fernando Cartwright, Sandrine Prasil and Kristina Shimmons. 2003. "Access, Persistence and Financing: First Results from the Postsecondary Education Participation Survey (PEPS)" Statistics Canada, Catalogue No. 81-595-MIE2003007.
- Barzun, Jacques. 1993. *The American University: How it Runs, Where it is Going*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2nd edition).
- Basken, Paul. 2009. "'Ghostwriting' is Still a Common Practice, Study Shows." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 10.
- Bauder, Harald. 2006. "The Segmentation of Academic Labour: A Canadian Example." *ACME – An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 4 (2): 228-239.
- Bauer, Louise. 2011. "Permanently Precarious? Contingent Academic Faculty Members, Professional Identity and Institutional Change in Quebec Universities." Unpublished Master's of Arts Thesis. At <spectrum.library.concordia.ca/7285/1/BirdsellBauer_MA_S2011.pdf>
- BBC News 2012. "Rise in UK Applications to Irish Universities." May 23. At <bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-18175060>
- _____. 2010. "University Jobs 'On the Line,' Says Union." July 7. At <bbc.co.uk/news/10537706>
- Beck, Hubert. 1947. *Men Who Control Our Universities*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Beecham, Rod. 2008. "The Language of Higher Education." *London Review of Education* 6 (2): 11-123.

- Beeston, Laura. 2012. "Liberal Budget Could Seriously Affect Quebec University Funding." *Montreal Gazette*, July 19.
- Bekelman, Justin, Yan Li and Cary Gross. 2003. "Scope and Impact of Financial Conflicts of Interest in Biomedical Research: A Systematic Review." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 289 (4): 454-465.
- Benda, Julien. 1930. *The Betrayal of the Intellectuals*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bennett, Roger and Rehnuma Ali-Choudhury. 2009. "Prospective Students' Perceptions of University Brands: An Empirical Study." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 19 (1): 85-107.
- Benjamin, Ernst. 2003. "Reappraisal and Implications for Policy and Research." *New Directions for Higher Education* 123: 79-113.
- Bennett, William. 1984. *To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education*. Washington: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Bercuson, David, Robert Bothwell and J.L. Granatstein. 1997. *Petrified Campus: The Crisis in Canada's Universities*. Toronto: Random House.
- _____. 1984. *The Great Brain Robbery: Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Berger, Joseph. 2009a. "Participation in Post-Secondary Education: Recent Trends." In J. Berger, A. Motte and A. Parkin (eds.), *The Price of Knowledge: Access and Student Finance in Canada*. Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- _____. 2009b. "Student Debt in Canada." In J. Berger, A. Motte and A. Parkin (eds.), *The Price of Knowledge: Access and Student Finance in Canada*. Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Bernasconi, Andrés. 2012. "Not Another Brick in the Wall: Capitalism and Student Protests in Chile." *Academic Matters*, November.
- _____. 2007. "Is There a Latin American Model of the University?" *Comparative Education Review* 52 (1): 27-52.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1977. *Class, Codes and Control*. (Vol. 3). London: Routledge.
- Berman, David. 1998. "Degrees For Your Dollar?" *Canadian Business* 70 (18).

- Berry, Joe. 2005. *Reclaiming the Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjuncts to Change Higher Education*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Birchard, Karen. 2007. "Canada Starts a 'Branding' Campaign to Help Universities Recruit More Foreign Students." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 29.
- _____. 2006. "Cheating is Rampant at Canadian Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 13.
- Bissell, Claude. 1968. *The Strength of the University*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Blackstock, Hannah. 2012. "Student Applications Drop Just the Tip of the Iceberg." *University World News* 209, February 19.
- Bloom, Alan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bloom, Michael (ed.). 1990. *Reaching for Success: Business and Education Working Together. First National Conference on Business-Education Partnerships*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
- Blumenthal, David, Nancyanne Causino, Eric Campbell and Karen Louis. 1996. "Relationships between Academic Institutions and Industry in the Life Sciences – An Industry Survey." *New England Journal of Medicine* 334 (6): 368-374.
- Bok, Derek. 2004. "The Benefits and Costs of Commercialization of the Academy." In D. Stein (ed.), *Buying In or Selling Out?: The Commercialization of the American Research University*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- _____. 2003. *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1990. *Universities and the Future of America*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Bollier, David. 2002. *Silent Theft: The Private Plunder of our Common Wealth*. New York: Routledge.
- Bouchard, Brigitte and John Zhao. 2000. "University Education: Recent Trends in Participation, Accessibility and Returns." Statistics Canada, *Education Quarterly Review* 6 (4): 1-61.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1988. *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- _____. 1977. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." In J Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bousquet, Marc. 2008. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*: New York: New York University Press.
- Bowie, Norman. 1994. *University-Business Partnerships: An Assessment*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boyer, Ernest. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bradshaw, James. 2012. "No Department is Safe as Universities Employ U.S. Cost-Cutting Strategy." *Globe and Mail*, December 25.
- _____. 2011. "For Undergrads at Canada's Universities, a New Way of Learning." *Globe and Mail*, September 14.
- Brainard, Jeffrey. 2006. "Study Finds Conflicts of Interest on Many Research-Review Boards." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 8.
- Bramwell, Allison and David Wolfe. 2008. "Universities and Regional Economic Development: The Entrepreneurial University of Waterloo." *Research Policy* 37 (8): 1175-1187.
- Breslauer, Helen. 1985. "Women in the Professoriate – The Case of Multiple Disadvantage." In C. Watson (ed.), *The Professoriate – Occupation in Crisis*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Brock University. 2009. "Brock 2014: Knowledge, Engagement, Transformation." At <brocku.ca/webfm_send/425>
- Brotheridge, Céleste and Raymond Lee. 2005. "Correlates and Consequences of Degree Purchasing among Canadian University Students." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 35 (2): 71-97.
- Brown, Louise. 2012a. "Why Canada's Professors are the Best (Best-Paid, that is)." *Toronto Star*, March 22.
- _____. 2012b. "York University's \$60 Million Deal With Jim Balsillie's Think Tank Cancelled over Lack of Faculty Support." *Toronto Star*, April 2.

- Brownlee, Jamie. 2005. *Ruling Canada: Corporate Cohesion and Democracy*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Bruneau, William and Donald Savage. 2002. *Counting out the Scholars: How Performance Indicators Undermine Universities and Colleges*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Brulé, Elizabeth. 2004. "Going to Market: Neoliberalism and the Social Construction of the University Student as an Autonomous Consumer." In M. Reimer (ed.), *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Bubela, Tania and Timothy Caulfield. 2010. "Role and Reality: Technology Transfer at Canadian Universities." *Trends in Biotechnology* 28 (9): 447-451.
- Buchbinder, Howard. 1993. "The Market Oriented University and the Changing Role of Knowledge." *Higher Education* 26 (3).
- Buchbinder, Howard and Janice Newson. 1990. "Corporate-University Linkages in Canada: Transforming a Public Institution." *Higher Education* 20 (4): 355-379.
- Budros, Art. 2002. "Do University Presidents Make a Difference? A Strategic Leadership Theory of University Retrenchment." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 32 (1): 91-124.
- Burd, Stephen. 2002. "'Lack of Aid Will Keep 170,000 Qualified, Needy Students Out of College This Year, Report Warns.'" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 27.
- Burgan, Mary. 2008. "Production in the Humanities." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Business Council on National Issues. 1993. *Building a New Century Economy: The Canadian Challenge*. Ottawa.
- Business-Higher Education Forum. 2001. *Working Together, Creating Knowledge*. The University-Industry Research Collaboration Initiative. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Burke, Mike and Joanne Naiman. 2003. "Dueling Identities and Faculty Unions: A Canadian Case Study." In D. Herman and J. Schmid (eds.), *Cogs in the Classroom Factory: The Changing Identity of Academic Labor*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Byleveld, Herbert. 1966. *Corporate Aid to Higher Education in Canada*. Montreal: National Industrial Conference Board.

- Calderon, Angel. "Massification Continues to Transform Higher Education." *University World News* 237, September 2.
- Calgary Herald. 2008. "University Presidents' Pay Cracks \$500,000." April 4.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2006. "The University and the Public Good." *Thesis Eleven* 84: 7-43.
- Callender, Claire. 2008. "The Impact of Term-Time Employment on Higher Education Students' Academic Attainment and Achievement." *Journal of Education Policy* 23 (4): 359-377.
- Calvert, John and Larry Kuehn. 1993. *Pandora's Box: Corporate Power, Free Trade and Canadian Education*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Cameron, David. 2002. "The Challenge of Change: Canadian Universities in the 21st Century." *Canadian Public Administration* 45 (2): 145-174.
- _____. 1991. *More Than an Academic Question: Universities, Government, and Public Policy in Canada*. Halifax: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Cameron, James. 1978. *On the Idea of a University*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Camfield, David. 2012. "Quebec's 'Red Square' Movement: The Story So Far." *The Bullet*, Socialist Project E-Bulletin No. 680, August 13.
- Campbell, Eric, Russell Gruen, James Mountford, Lawrence Miller, Paul Cleary and David Blumenthal. "A National Survey of Physician-Industry Relationships." *New England Journal of Medicine* 356 (17): 1742-1750.
- Canadian Association of University Teachers. 2013a. "Newfoundland Announces Continuing Tuition Freeze, Efficiency Review." *CAUT Bulletin* 60 (4). Ottawa.
- _____. 2013b. "Private College Deal with University of Manitoba Generates Controversy." *CAUT Bulletin* 60 (1). Ottawa.
- _____. 2013b. "CAUT Analysis of Federal Budget 2013." Ottawa.
- _____. 2012a. *CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada 2012-2013*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2011a. "Politicians Attack Toronto Grad Student." *CAUT Bulletin* 58 (1). Ottawa.

- _____. 2011b. “Open Letter to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.” At <wlufa.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/CAUT-to-AUCC-re-Academic-Freedom-2011-11-04.pdf>
- _____. 2011c. “Decima Summary: Public Opinion and Post-Secondary Education.” At <caut.ca/uploads/DecimaSummary_Fall2011.pdf>
- _____. 2011d. *CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada 2011-2012*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2011e. “CAUT Stands in Solidarity with Striking Academic Staff at Vancouver Island University.” At <caut.ca/news_details.asp?nid=1637&page=490>
- _____. 2010a. “Policy Statement on Fairness for Contract Academic Staff.” At <caut.ca/pages.asp?lang=1&page=269>
- _____. 2010b. “The Changing Academy?” *CAUT Education Review* 12 (1).
- _____. 2010c. “Fight Brewing over Ottawa U’s Proposed Cuts.” *CAUT Bulletin* 57 (4). Ottawa.
- _____. 2010d. “NSERC Discovery Grants Spiral Downward.” *CAUT Bulletin* 57 (8). Ottawa.
- _____. 2009a. “University Finances, 2007-2008.” *CAUT Education Review* 11 (1).
- _____. 2009b. “Public Opinion of Post-Secondary Education Issues.” At <caut.ca/uploads/Summary_Spring_2009.pdf>
- _____. 2009c. “Knowledge Infrastructure Program Funding Going Mostly to Repairs, Not Research.” At <caut.ca/pages.asp?page=836&lang=1>
- _____. 2007. “CAUT’s Submission to the Review of the Canada Student Loan Program.” At <caut.ca/pages.asp?page=620&lang=1>
- _____. 2006. *CAUT Almanac of Post-Secondary Education in Canada 2006*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2003. “University Tuition Fees in Canada, 2003.” *CAUT Education Review* 5 (1).
- Canadian Bar Association. 2003. “Response to the Provost Study of Accessibility and Career Choice in the University of Toronto Faculty of Law.” At <cba.org/cba/submissions/pdf/03-13-eng.pdf>
- Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. 2013a. “Not Your Parents Education: Ontario Tuition Fact Sheet.” Ottawa.

- _____. 2013b. *Alternative Federal Budget 2013: Doing Better Together*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2008. "Corporate Initiatives on Campus: A 2008 Snapshot." Ottawa.
- _____. 2005. *Challenging McWorld* (2nd edition). Ottawa.
- Canadian Council on Learning. 2010a. "Tallying the Costs of Post-Secondary Education: The Challenge of Managing Student Debt and Loan Repayment in Canada." Ottawa.
- _____. 2010b. "State of Learning in Canada: A Year in Review." Ottawa.
- _____. 2009a. "2008 Survey of Canadian Attitudes Toward Learning: Results for Learning Throughout the Lifespan." Ottawa.
- _____. 2009b. "Where Did They Go? Post-Secondary Experiences, Attitudes & Intentions of 2005/06 BC High School Graduates Who Did Not Pursue Public Post-Secondary Education in British Columbia by Fall 2007." Vancouver: British Columbia Council on Admissions and Transfer.
- _____. 2009c. "Post-Secondary Education in Canada: Meeting Our Needs?" Ottawa.
- _____. 2007. "Canada's PSE Performance: File Under 'M' for Missing." At < ccl-cca.ca/ccl/Newsroom/Releases/20070920ReleaseCanadasPSEperformance.html > September 20.
- Canadian Federation of Students. 2012. "Public Education for the Public Good: A National Vision for Canada's Post-Secondary Education System." Ottawa.
- _____. 2011. "83% of Nova Scotians Support Reducing Tuition Fees." At < cfs-fcee.ca/html/english/media/mediapage.php?release_id=1196 >
- _____. 2010. "The Racialised Impact of Tuition Fees: Assessing the Social Cost of Post-Secondary Education." Ottawa.
- _____. 2009. "Canada's Education Action Plan." Ottawa.
- _____. 2007a. "Strategy for Change: Money Does Matter." Ottawa.
- _____. 2007b. "Millennium Scholarship Foundation: A Failed Experiment in Student Financial Aid." Ottawa.

- Canadian Health Coalition. 2011. "Funding Decisions for B.C.'s Drug Formulary to be Based on Industry Marketing instead of Independent Drug Assessment." At <healthcoalition.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/TI-BN.pdf>
- Canadian Union of Public Employees. 2010a. "Have U, Have Not U." At <cupe.ca/updir/Have_U,_Have_Not_U.pdf>
- _____. 2010b. "Private For-Profit Education Grows in Canada." At <cupe.ca/post-secondary/private-for-profit-education-grows>
- _____. 2010c. "'Resource Optimization' in Canadian Universities Threatens Education, Job Security." At <cupe.ca/education/resource-optimization-canadian>
- _____. 2009a. "P3s Spread on Quebec Campuses." At <cupe.ca/privwatchjan09/P3s-Quebec-universities>
- _____. 2009b. "McMaster Sessionals Picket Two Convocation Ceremonies to Protest Layoffs." At <cupe.ca/post-secondary/McMaster-Sessionals>
- _____. 2008a. "Police Probe Montreal University P3 Deal." At <cupe.ca/post-secondary/Police-probe-Montrea>
- _____. 2008b. "Contract Faculty at McMaster Rally to Demand Security, Equity and Parity as Contract Deadline Looms." At <cupe.ca/news/mcmastercontractfaculty>
- _____. 2001. "Private Lessons: For Profits Sell Degrees." CUPE's 2001 Annual Report on Privatization.
- Carey, Alex. 1997. *Taking the Risk out of Democracy: Corporate Propaganda versus Freedom and Liberty*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Carleton University Academic Staff Association. 2010. "Bargaining Bulletin #3." At <cuasa.ca/bargaining/pdf/2010/bargaining_bulletin3.pdf>
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. 1973. *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Carnoy, Martin and Henry Levin (eds.). 1976. *The Limits of Educational Reform*. New York: David McKay.
- Carroll, William. 2004. *Corporate Power in a Globalizing World: A Study in Elite Social Organization*. Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

- Carroll, William, Linda Christiansen-Ruffman, Raymond Currie and Deborah Harrison (eds.), *Fragile Truths: Twenty-five Years of Sociology and Anthropology in Canada*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2006. *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Carvalho, Sergio and Márcio de Oliveira Mota. 2010. "The Role of Trust in Creating Value and Student Loyalty in Relational Exchanges between Higher Education Institutions and their Students." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 20 (1): 145-165.
- CBC News. 2011. "Canadians Save Too Little for Children's Schooling, TD Says." July 19. At <cbc.ca/news/business/story/2011/07/19/td-survey-education-finances.html>
- Chan, Adrienne and Donald Fisher. 2008a. *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- _____. 2008b. "Academic Culture and the Research-Intensive University: The Impact of Commercialism and Scientism." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Chan-Tiberghien, Jennifer. 2010. "Academic Capitalism in Japan: National University Incorporation and Special Zones for Structural Reform." In J. Zajda and M. Geo-Jaja (eds.), *The Politics of Education Reforms*. New York: Springer.
- Chapin, Angelina. 2010. "Lansbridge University Gets a Permanent Black Mark." *Canadian Business* 83 (18).
- Chapnick, Adam. 2012. "The Teaching-Only Stream." *University Affairs*, October 10.
- Charbonneau, Leo and Rosanne Tamburri. 2013. "Federal Budget Stays the Course, While Provinces Begin to Pull Back." *University Affairs*, March 22.
- Cheadle, Bruce. 2012a. "Carleton University Admits to Issues with \$15-Million Donor Deal for Politics School." *Globe and Mail*, July 12.
- _____. 2012b. "Carleton University Rewrites Controversial \$15-Million Donor Deal." *Globe and Mail*, August 28.
- Checkoway, Barry. 2001. "Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University." *The Journal of Higher Education* 72 (2): 125-147.
- Chernomas, Robert and Errol Black. 2004. "Fast Facts: Should University Students Pay More?" Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

- Cho, Mildred and Lisa Bero. 1996. "The Quality of Drug Studies Published in Symposium Proceedings." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 124 (5): 485-489.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2009. "An Email from Noam Chomsky." At <chomsky.info/letters/20091130.htm>
- _____. 2003. *Chomsky on Democracy and Education*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- _____. 1997. *Perspectives on Power: Reflections on Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York: Black Rose Books.
- _____. 1992. *Chronicles of Dissent*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- _____. 1988. *The Culture of Terrorism*. Boston: South End Press.
- _____. 1987a. "The Responsibility of Intellectuals." In J. Peck (ed.), *The Chomsky Reader*. New York: Pantheon.
- _____. 1987b. "Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship." In J. Peck (ed.), *The Chomsky Reader*. New York: Pantheon.
- _____. 1982. "Intellectuals and the State." In *Towards a New Cold War*. New York: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, Noam and Michel Foucault. 2006. *The Chomsky-Foucault Debate: On Human Nature*. New York: The New Press.
- Christensen, Clayton and Henry Eyring. 2011. *The Innovative University: Changing the DNA of Higher Education from the Inside Out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, E. Ann. 2000. "Academia in the Service of Industry: The Ag Biotech Model." In J. Turk (ed.), *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Clark, Ian, Greg Moran, Michael Skolnik and David Trick. 2009. *Academic Transformation: The Forces Reshaping Higher Education in Ontario*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clark, Ian, David Trick and Richard Van Loon. 2011. *Academic Reform: Policy Options for Improving the Quality and Cost-Effectiveness of Undergraduate Education in Ontario*. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clarke, Burton. 1998. *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Clement, Wallace. 1975. *The Canadian Corporate Elite: An Analysis of Economic Power*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Clinton, Bill. 2012. "Transcript of Bill Clinton's Speech to the Democratic National Convention." *The New York Times*, September 5.
- Coalition on the Academic Workforce. 2012. "A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members: A Summary of Findings on Part-Time Faculty Respondents to the Coalition on the Academic Workforce Survey of Contingent Faculty Members and Instructors." At <academicworkforce.org/survey.html>
- Coates, Ken and Bill Morrison. 2011. *Campus Confidential: 100 Startling Things You Don't Know about Canadian Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Cockburn, Alexander. "When Half a Million Americans Died and Nobody Noticed." *The Week*, May 9. At <theweek.co.uk/us/46535/when-half-million-americans-died-and-nobody-noticed>
- Cockburn, Iain and Rebecca Henderson. 1996. "Public-Private Interaction in Pharmaceutical Research." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 93 (23): 12725-12730.
- Coelli, Michael. 2009. "Tuition Fees and Equality of University Enrolment." *Canadian Journal of Economics* 42 (3): 1072-1099.
- _____. 2005. "Tuition, Rationing and Inequality in Post-Secondary Education Attendance." University of British Columbia Working Paper.
- Cohen, Joanna. 2008. "Principles and Interest: Is the Academy an Accomplice in a Corporate-Caused Pandemic?" In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Cohen, Marjorie Griffin. 2000. "Trading Away the Public System: The WTO and Post-Secondary." In J. Turk (ed.), *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Cohen, Patricia. 2009. "In Tough Times, the Humanities Must Justify Their Worth." *The New York Times*, February 24.
- Cole, Trevor. 1998. "Ivy-League Hustle." *Report on Business Magazine* 14 (12).
- Conlon, Michael. 2006. "The Politics of Access: Measuring the Social Returns on Post-Secondary Education." *Higher Education Management and Policy* 18 (2): 82-90.

- _____. 2004. "Performance Indicators: Accountable to Whom?" *Higher Education Management and Policy* 16 (1): 41-48.
- Conway, John. 2004. "Improving Access to Affordable University Education in Saskatchewan." Regina: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Cooper, Barry. 2012. "Bureaucrats Have Taken Control of Universities." *Calgary Herald*, May 1.
- Copping, Jasper. 2011. "A Level Students Shun Humanities at University." *The Telegraph*, August 14.
- Corry, James Alexander. 1970. *Farewell the Ivory Tower: Universities in Transition*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Côté, James and Anton Allahar. 2011. *Lowering Higher Education: The Rise of Corporate Universities and the Fall of Liberal Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 2007. *Ivory Tower Blues: A University System in Crisis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Coté Mark, Richard Day and Greig de Peuter. 2007. "Academicus Affinitatus: Academic Dissent, Community Education, and Critical U." In M. Coté, R. Day and G. de Peuter (eds.), *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Coughlan, Sean. 2013. "More Universities to Charge Maximum Fees." *BBC News*, July 10.
- Couldry, Nick and Angela McRobbie. 2010. "The Death of the University, English Style." *Culture Machine, Interzone*. At <culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/417/430>
- Council of Canadian Academies. 2012a. "Strengthening Canada's Research Capacity: The Gender Dimension." Ottawa.
- _____. 2012b. "The State of Science and Technology in Canada, 2012." Ottawa.
- _____. 2006. "The State of Science and Technology in Canada: Summary and Main Findings." Ottawa.
- Council of Ontario Universities. 2012. "Employment Outcomes of 2009 Graduates of Ontario University Undergraduate Programs: 2011 Survey Highlights." Toronto.

- _____. 2011a. “Innovative Ideas: Improving Efficiency at Ontario Universities.” Toronto.
- _____. 2011b. “Employment Outcomes of 2008 Graduates of Ontario University Undergraduate Programs: 2010 Survey Highlights.”
- _____. 2010a. “Government Infrastructure Dollars at Work.” Toronto.
- _____. 2010b. “Inventory of Physical Facilities of Ontario Universities 2007-08.” Toronto.
- Counts, George. 1927. *The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Couvée, Koos. 2012. “Postgraduate Students are Being Used as ‘Slave Labour.’” *The Independent*, May 27.
- Cox, Ana Marie. 2003. “None of Your Business: The Rise of the University of Phoenix and For-Profit Education – and Why it Will Fail Us All.” In B. Johnson, P. Kavanagh and K. Mattson (eds.), *Steal This University: The Rise of the Corporate University and the Academic Labor Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2000. “Study Shows Colleges’ Dependence on their Part-Time Instructors.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 1.
- Crawshaw, Caitlin. 2013. “Taking Care of Business at U of Alberta.” *University Affairs*, March 13.
- Crespo, Manuel and Houssine Dridi. 2007 “Intensification of University-Industry Relationships and its Impact on Academic Research.” *Higher Education* 54 (1): 61-84.
- Crocker, Robert and Alex Usher. 2006. “Innovation and Differentiation in Canada’s Post-Secondary Institutions.” Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Cross, Allison. 2010. “Report Reveals Gender Gap in University Professor Salaries.” *Montreal Gazette*, August 13.
- Crozier, Michel, Samuel Huntington and Joji Watanuki. 1975. *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*. New York: New York University Press.
- Cummings, W. K. 1999. “The Service Orientation in Academia, or Who Serves in Comparative Perspective.” In I. Fägerlind, I. Holmesland, and G. Strömqvist (eds.),

Higher Education at the Crossroads. Stockholm: Institute of International Education, Stockholm University.

_____. 1998. "The Service University in Comparative Perspective." *Higher Education* 35 (1): 1-8.

Currie, Jan and Janice Newson. (eds.) 1998. *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Curtis, Bruce. 1988. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*. London, Ontario: Althouse Press.

D'Aquino, Thomas and David Stewart-Patterson. 2001. *Northern Edge: How Canadian Can Triumph in the Global Economy*. Toronto: Stoddart.

Davies, Scott and Linda Quirke. 2002. "The New Entrepreneurship in Higher Education: The Impact of Tuition Increases at an Ontario University." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 32 (3): 85-110.

de Broucker, Patrice. 2005. "Getting There and Staying There: Low-Income Students and Post-Secondary Education." Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2006. "The University in the 21st Century: Toward a Democratic and Emancipatory University Reform." In R. Rhoads and C. Torres (eds.), *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

de Vise, Daniel. 2010. "Report Finds Fraud in For-Profit Education Firms' Recruiting." *The Washington Post*, August 4.

Deem, Rosemary. 2008. "Unravelling the Fabric of Academe: The Managerialist University and its Implications for the Integrity of Academic Work." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.

Deem, Rosemary and Kevin Brehony. 2005. "Management as Ideology: The Case of 'New Managerialism' in Higher Education." *Oxford Review of Education* 31 (2): 217-235.

Denholm, Andrew. 2012a. "Universities Oppose Plan to Set Recruitment Targets." *Scotland Herald*, March 1.

_____. 2012b. "Universities Ordered to Admit Deprived Students." *Scotland Herald*, October 5.

- Deresiewicz, William. 2011. "Faulty Towers: The Crisis in Higher Education." *The Nation*, May 4. At < thenation.com/article/160410/faulty-towers-crisis-higher-education>
- Desjardins, Louise. 2012. "Profile and Labour Market Outcomes of Doctoral Graduates from Ontario Universities." Statistics Canada, Catalogue No. 81-595-M.
- Dewey, John. 1966. *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: Free Press (originally published in 1916).
- _____. 1964. *John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings*. New York: Modern Library.
- Diallo, Bayero, Claude Trottier and Pierre Doray. 2009. "What Do We Know About the Pathways and Transitions of Canadian Students in Post-Secondary Education?" Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Dillon, Sam. 2007. "Troubles Grow for a University Built on Profits." *The New York Times*, February 11.
- Dobbie, David and Ian Robinson. 2008. "Reorganizing Higher Education in the United States and Canada: The Erosion of Tenure and the Unionization of Contingent Faculty." *Labor Studies Journal* 33 (2): 117-140.
- Dodge, David. 1981. *Labour Market Development in the 1980s*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Doherty-Delorme, Denise and Erika Shaker. 2004. "'Accessive' Policies or Excessive Debt: Who's Paying for Higher Education?" In D. Doherty-Delorme and E. Shaker (eds.), *Missing Pieces V: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Donoghue, Frank. 2008. *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. 1991. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: Free Press.
- Duderstadt, James. 2004. "Delicate Balance: Market Forces Versus the Public Interest." In D. Stein (ed.), *Buying In or Selling Out?: The Commercialization of the American Research University*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Duff, James and Robert Berdahl. 1966. "University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and

- the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.” Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Duff, Joel. 2010. “Keep Public Funds Away from the Lobbyists.” *University World News* 144, October 24.
- Dunn, Mark. 2012. “Bank of Canada Flags Rising Household Debt.” *Toronto Sun*, October 23.
- Dunne, Keith and Nick Falvo. 2011. “Danny Williams’ PSE Policy a Model for other Provinces.” Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor, May.
- Dyer-Witheford, Nick. 2007. “Teaching and Tear Gas: The University in the Era of General Intellect.” In M. Coté, R. Day and G. de Peuter (eds.), *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Eastman, Julia. 2007. “Revenue Generation and its Consequences for Academic Capital, Values and Autonomy: Insights from Canada.” *Higher Education Management and Policy* 19 (3): 1-17.
- Economic Council of Canada. 1964. *First Annual Review: Economic Goals for Canada to 1970*. Ottawa.
- _____. 1965. *Second Annual Review: Towards Sustained and Balanced Economic Growth*. Ottawa.
- Ehrenberg, Ronald and Liang Zhang. 2005. “Do Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Matter?” *Journal of Human Resources* 40: 647-659.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1997. “What Yale is Teaching Us.” In C. Nelson (ed.), *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ekos Research Associates. 2009. “Formative Evaluation of the Networks of Centres of Excellence – Centres of Excellence for Commercialization and Research Program: Final Report.” Ottawa.
- _____. 2006. “Investing in Their Future: A Survey of Student and Parental Support for Learning.” Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

- _____. 2005. "Ontario Universities: Public Perceptions of Tuition and Funding." Ottawa: Council of Ontario Universities.
- _____. 2003. "Public Perceptions on Quality: Final Report." Ottawa: Council of Ontario Universities.
- Ellis, Mark. 2012. "Too Dear for the Poor: Leading Academics Fear Tuition Fees Will Price Working Class Students out of Higher Education." *The Mirror*, September 2012.
- Emberley, Peter. 1996. *Zero Tolerance: Hot Button Politics in Canada's Universities*. Toronto: Penguin Books.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. 1844. *Essays: Second Series*. Boston: James Munroe.
- Enros, Philip. 1991. "The 'Bureau of Scientific and Industrial Research and School of Specific Industries': The Royal Canadian Institute's Attempt at Organizing Industrial Research in Toronto, 1914-1918." In R. Jarrell and J. Hull (eds.), *Science, Technology and Medicine in Canada's Past: Selections from Scientia Canadensis*. Thornhill, Ontario: The Scientia Press.
- _____. 1983. "The University of Toronto and Industrial Research in the Early Twentieth Century." In R. Jarrell and A. Roos (eds.), *Critical Issues in the History of Canadian Science, Technology and Medicine*. Ottawa: HSTC Publications.
- Enros, Philip and Michael Farley. 1986. "University Offices for Technology Transfer: Toward the Service University." Ottawa: Science Council of Canada.
- Essaji, Azim and Sue Horton. 2010. "Silent Escalation: Salaries of Senior University Administrators in Ontario, 1996-2006." *Higher Education* 59 (3): 303-322.
- Etzkowitz, Henry. 2004. "The Evolution of the Entrepreneurial University." *International Journal of Technology and Globalisation* 1 (1): 64-77.
- Etzkowitz, Henry and James Dzisah. 2008. "Rethinking Development: Circulation in the Triple Helix." *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management* 20 (6): 653-666.
- Etzkowitz, Henry and Loet Leydesdorff. 2000. "The Dynamics of Innovation: From National Systems and 'Mode2' to a Triple Helix of University-Industry-Government Relations." *Research Policy* 29: 109-123.

- _____. 1998. "The Endless Transition: A 'Triple Helix' of University-Industry-Government Relations." *Minerva* 36: 203-208.
- Etzkowitz, Henry, Andrew Webster and Peter Healy (eds.). 1998. *Capitalizing Knowledge: New Intersections of Industry and Academia*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fabrizio, Kira. 2007. "University Patenting and the Pace of Industrial Innovation." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 16 (4): 505-535.
- Fagin, Dan and Marianne Lavell. 1996. *Toxic Deception*. New Jersey: Carol Publishing Group.
- Fallis, George. 2008. "Professors as Public Intellectuals." *Academic Matters*, October/November.
- _____. 2007. *Multiversities, Ideas, and Democracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 2005. "The Mission of the University." *Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education* 26.
- Falvo, Nick. 2012. "Canada's Self-Imposed Crisis in Post-Secondary Education." The Progressive Economics Forum. At <progressive-economics.ca/2012/06/07/canadas-self-imposed-crisis-in-post-secondary-education/>
- Fanelli, Daniele. 2009. "How Many Scientists Fabricate and Falsify Research? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Survey Data." *PLoS ONE* 4 (5): e5738.
- Fang, Ferric, R. Grant Steen and Arturo Casadevall. 2012. "Misconduct Accounts for the Majority of Retracted Scientific Publications." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (42): 17028-17033.
- Fekete, John. 1994. *Moral Panic: Biopolitics Rising*. Montreal: Robert Davies Publishing.
- Ferguson, Charles. 2010. "Larry Summers and the Subversion of Economics." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 3.
- Ferrie, Helke. 2013. *Creative Outrage*. Caledon, ON: KOS Publishing.

- _____. 2009. "Deadly Side-Effects of Prescription Drugs Spark Lawsuits." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor, June.
- Field, Erica. 2009. "Educational Debt Burden and Career Choice: Evidence from a Financial Aid Experiment at NYU Law School." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1 (1): 1-21.
- Figueroa-Clark, Victor. 2011. "Student Protest Movement Goes Global." *University World News* 200, December 4.
- Findlay, Len. 2010. "Report: Investigation into the Termination of Dr. Ramesh Thakur as Director of the Balsillie School of International Affairs." Ottawa: Canadian Association of University Teachers. At<caut.ca/uploads/Findlay_Report_Final.pdf>
- Fine, Philip. 2010a. "Key Bodies Axed." *University World News* 109, January 31.
- _____. 2010b. "Canadian Presidents Stress Partnerships." *University World News* 148, November 21.
- _____. 2009a. "PhD Offers Little Salary Difference." *University World News* 77, May 24.
- _____. 2009b. "Professor Admits to Ghost-Written Paper." *University World News* 90, August 30.
- Finkelstein, Martin. 2007. "Negotiating the New Academy." *Academic Matters*, April.
- Finnie, Ross, Marc Frenette, Richard Mueller and Arthur Sweetman (eds.). 2010. *Pursuing Higher Education in Canada: Economic, Social and Policy Dimensions*. Queen's Policy Series Study #70. Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.
- Finnie, Ross, Stephen Childs and Andrew Wismer. 2011. "Access to Postsecondary Education: How Ontario Compares." Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Fish, Stanley. 2008. *Save the World on Your Own Time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher, Donald and Janet Atkinson-Grosjean. 2002. "Brokers on the Boundary: Academy-Industry Liaison in Canadian Universities." *Higher Education* 44 (3-4): 449-467.
- Fisher, Donald and Kjell Rubenson. 1998. "The Changing Political Economy: The Private and Public Lives of Canadian Universities." In. J. Currie and J. Newson

- (eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Fisher, Donald, Kjell Rubenson, Glen Jones and Theresa Shanahan. 2009. "The Political Economy of Post-Secondary Education: A Comparison of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec." *Higher Education* 57 (5): 549-566.
- Fisher, Donald, Kjell Rubenson, Jean Bernatchez, Robert Clift, Glen Jones, Jacy Lee, Madeleine MacIvor, John Meredith, Theresa Shanahan and Claude Trottier. 2006. *Canadian Federal Policy and Postsecondary Education*. University of British Columbia: Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training.
- Flanagan, Tom. 2007. "A Conservative Look at the Liberal Arts." *Academic Matters*, April.
- Fluxgold, Howard. 1973. "Who Killed the Goose?" In D. Myers (ed.), *The Failure of Educational Reform in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Fowke, Vernon. 1959. "Who Should Determine University Policy?" *CAUT Bulletin* 7 (4).
- Franklin, Ursula. 2000. "What is at Stake? Universities in Context." In J. Turk (ed.), *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Freire, Paulo, Miguel Escobar, Alfredo Fernández and Gilberto Guevara-Niebla. 1994. *Paulo Freire on Higher Education: A Dialogue at the National University of Mexico*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Frenette, Marc. 2008. "University Access Amid Tuition Fee Deregulation: Evidence from Ontario Professional Programs." *Canadian Public Policy* 34 (1): 89-109.
- Freudenburg, William. 2005. "Seeding Science, Courting Conclusions: Reexamining the Intersection of Science, Corporate Cash, and the Law." *Sociological Forum* 20 (1): 3-33.
- Friedberg, Mark, Bernard Saffran, Tammy Stinson, Wendy Nelson, and Charles Bennett. 1999. "Evaluation of Conflict of Interest in Economic Analysis of New Drugs Used in Oncology." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 282 (15): 1453-1457.

- Fulton, E. Margaret. 1986. "Historical Commitments in New Times: The Restructuring and Reorientation of Teaching and Research." In W. Neilson and C. Gaffield (eds.), *Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty-First Century*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Gaffikin, Frank and David Perry. 2009. "Discourses and Strategic Visions: The U.S. Research University as an Institutional Manifestation of Neoliberalism in a Global Era." *American Educational Research Journal* 46 (1): 115-144.
- Galbraith, John Kenneth. 2007. *The New Industrial State*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Gallagher, Paul. 2012. "Revealed: How the Cost of a Degree is Now £100,000." *The Independent*, December 9.
- Gappa, Judith and David Leslie. 1993. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gatto, John Taylor. 2003. *The Underground History of American Education*. New York: The Oxford Village Press.
- Gauthier, Michelle. 2004. "Incentives and Accountability: The Canadian Context." *Higher Education Management and Policy* 16 (2): 95-107.
- Geiger, Roger. 2004. *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Gergin, Maria. 2011. *Silencing Dissent: The Conservative Record*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Ghabrial, Sarah. 2009. "Getting a (Neo-)Liberal Arts Education in Canada." *Rabble.ca*, March 25. At <rabble.ca/news/getting-neo-liberal-arts-education-canada>
- Ghosh, Pallab. 2012. "Canadian Government is 'Muzzling its Scientists'" *BBC News*, February 17. At <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-16861468>>
- Gibb, Allan, Gay Haskins and Ian Robertson. 2009. *Leading the Entrepreneurial University: Meeting the Entrepreneurial Development Needs of Higher Education Institutions*. At <ncge.org.uk/publication/leading_the_entrepreneurial_university.pdf>

- Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Seott and Martin Trow. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Gilbert, Sid, Judy Chapman, Peter Dietsche, Paul Grayson and John Gardner. 1997. *From Best Intentions to Best Practices: The First Year Experience in Canadian Postsecondary Education*. Columbia, South Carolina: National Resource Centre for the Freshman Experience, University of South Carolina.
- Gingrich, Paul. 2011. "After the Freeze: Restoring University Affordability in Saskatchewan." Saskatchewan: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- _____. 2009. "A Reappraisal of University Access and Affordability 2009." Saskatchewan: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin. 2011. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, Henry. 2010. "Public Values, Higher Education and the Scourge of Neoliberalism: Politics at the Limits of the Social." *Culture Machine* (Interzone) At <culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/426/444>
- _____. 2008. "Marketing the University: Corporate Power and the Academic Factory." *Our Schools, Our Selves* 17 (3): 147-165.
- _____. 2007a. *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. Boulder, Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.
- _____. 2007b. "Utopian Thinking in Dangerous Times: Critical Pedagogy and the Project of Educated Hope." In M. Coté, R. Day and G. de Peuter (eds.), *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments Against Neoliberal Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 2003. "Public Time and Educated Hope: Educational Leadership and the War Against Youth." At < units.muohio.edu/eduleadership/anthology/OA/OA03001.html#_edn32>
- _____. 2002. "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review* 72 (4): 425-463.
- Giroux, Henry and Susan Searls Giroux. 2004. *Take Back Higher Education: Race, Youth, and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Giroux, Henry and Kostas Myrsiades (eds.). 2001. *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Godin, Benoît and Yves Gingras. 2000. "Impact of Collaborative Research on Academic Science." *Science and Public Policy* 27 (1): 65-73.
- Goodman, Paul. 1959. *Growing Up Absurd*. New York: Random House.
- Gould, Eric. 2003. *The University in a Corporate Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Government of Canada. 2011. "Imagination to Innovation: State of the Nation 2010." Ottawa: Science, Technology and Innovation Council.
- _____. 2009. "Seizing Global Advantage: A Global Commerce Strategy for Securing Canada's Growth & Prosperity." Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- _____. 2007a. *Mobilizing Science and Technology to Canada's Advantage*. Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- _____. 2007b. "Budget Plan 2007: Aspire to a Stronger, Safer, Better Canada." Ottawa: Department of Finance.
- Government of Ontario. 2008. "Seizing Global Opportunities: Ontario's Innovation Agenda." At <docs.files.ontario.ca/documents/334/ontario-innovation-agenda.pdf>
- Government of Quebec. 2006. "An Innovative, Prosperous Québec: Québec Research and Innovation Strategy." At <frsq.gouv.qc.ca/en/publications/pdf/strategie_innovationEN.pdf>
- Graff, Harvey. 1976. "Respected and Profitable Labour." In G. Kealey and P. Warrian (eds.), *Essays in Canadian Working Class History*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.
- Graham, William. 2000. "Academic Freedom or Commercial License?" In J. Turk (ed.), *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

- Grant, Karen. 2002. "A Conversation on the Future of the Academy with James Turk, PhD, Executive Director, Canadian Association of University Teachers." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39 (3): 261-274.
- Green, Andrew, Wang Fangqing, Paul Cochrane, Jonathan Dyson and Carmen Paun. 2012. "English Spreads as Teaching Language in Universities Worldwide." *University World News* 229. July 8.
- Greenberg, Milton. 2004. "The University is Not a Business (and Other Fantasies)." *Educause* 39 (2): 10-16.
- Gross, Neil and Solon Simmons. 2007. "The Social and Political Views of American Professors." At <wjh.harvard.edu/~ngross/lounsberry_9-25.pdf>
- Guard, Julie, Rachel Gotthilf, Rachel Heinrichs, Brian Latour, Kyle Mytruk, Kim Parry, Zachery Saltis and Chris Rigaux. 2007. "Where Does the Money Go? University of Manitoba Senior Administrators Get Big Pay Hikes But Faculty and Staff Morale Remains Low." Winnipeg: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Guppy, Neil, Edward Grabb and Clayton Mollica. 2013. "The Canada Foundation for Innovation, Sociology of Knowledge, and the Re-engineering of the University." *Canadian Public Policy* 39 (1): 1-19.
- Gutstein, Donald. 2009. *Not a Conspiracy Theory: How Business Propaganda Hijacks Democracy*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- _____. 2008. "Conservative Think Tanks and the Academy: Credibility by Stealth?" In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Hans, Elisabeth. 2012. "An Opinion on the Implementation of Performance Indicators in New Brunswick Higher Education." At <fnbfa.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/An-opinion-on-the-implementation-of-Performance-Indicators-in-New-Brunswick-Higher-Education.pdf>
- Hardy, Cynthia. 1984. "The Management of University Cutbacks: Politics, Planning and Participation." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 14 (1).
- Harris, Robin. 1976. *A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663- 1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Harris, Sarah. 2012. "One in Five University Courses Scrapped Following Tripling of Tuition Fees." *Daily Mail*, December 2.

- Harvey, Lee. 2008. "Ranking of Higher Education Institutions: A Critical Review." *Quality in Higher Education* 14 (3): 187-207.
- Harvey, Marcus. 2008. "Tempers of the Times: The Politicization of Middle Eastern Studies." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Healy, David. 2008. "Academic Stalking and Brand Fascism." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Healy, David and Dinah Cattell. 2003. "The Interface between Authorship, Industry and Science in the Domain of Therapeutics." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 182: 22-27.
- Hearn, Alison. 2010. "Exploits in the Undercommons." In J. Newson and C. Polster (eds.), *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Hedges, Chris. 2010. *Death of the Liberal Class*. Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Henderson, Peter. 2012. "Carleton University Renegotiation Over \$15M Politics School Blindsides Donor." *Ottawa Citizen*, July 12.
- Henry, Julie. 2010. "Half of University Students Willing to Cheat, Study Finds." *The Telegraph*, June 20.
- Hentoff, Nat. 1967. *The Essays of A.J. Muste*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Halliwell, Janet. 2008. *The Nexus of Teaching and Research: Evidence and Insights from the Literature*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Hogben, Lancelot. 1936. *Mathematics for the Million*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Holden, Constance. 2006. "Professional Practice: Scientists Keep Some Data to Themselves." *Science* 311 (5760): 448.
- Hornosty, Jennie. 2004. "Corporate Challenges to Academic Freedom and Gender Equity." In M. Reimer (ed.), *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Horowitz, David. 2006. *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.

- Horowitz, David and Jacob Laksin. 2009. *One-Party Classroom: How Radical Professors at America's Top Colleges Indoctrinate Students and Undermine Our Democracy*. New York: Crown Forum Publishing Group.
- Houston, Susan. 1975. "Politics, Schools and Social Change in Upper Canada." In M. Katz and P. Mattingly (eds.), *Education and Social Change: Themes from Ontario's Past*. New York: New York University Press.
- Human Resources Development Canada. 2002. *Knowledge Matters: Skills and Learning for Canadians: Canada's Innovation Strategy*. Ottawa
- Hundley, Kris. 2011. "Billionaire's Role in Hiring Decisions at Florida State University Raises Questions." *St. Petersburg Times*, May 10.
- Hussey, Trevor and Patrick Smith. 2010. *The Trouble with Higher Education: A Critical Examination of Our Universities*. New York: Routledge.
- Impact Group. 2008. "The Economic Role and Influence of the Social Sciences and Humanities: A Conjecture." Toronto.
- Industry Canada. 2012a. "Knowledge Infrastructure Program Finale." Ottawa.
- _____. 2012b. "Priorities for KIP Funding by Province and Territory." Ottawa.
- _____. 2002. *Achieving Excellence: Investing in People, Knowledge and Opportunity*. Ottawa.
- Innis, Harold. 1946. *Political Economy in the Modern State*. Toronto: Ryerson Press.
- Ipsos Reid. 2012. "Imagine Education au/in Canada: Executive Summary of Qualitative Research." Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. At <[epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por ef/foreign_affairs_intl_trade/2012/064-11/summary.pdf](http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/pwgsc-tpsgc/por%20ef/foreign_affairs_intl_trade/2012/064-11/summary.pdf)>
- _____. 2004. "Canadians Attitudes Towards Financing Post-Secondary Education: Who Should Pay and How?" Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- _____. 2001. "Post-Secondary Accessibility Study." At <assembly.ab.ca/lao/library/egovdocs/alle/2001/130165.pdf>
- Ivanova, Iglia. 2012. "Paid in Full Update: Who Pays for University Education in BC?" Vancouver: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

- Jacoby, Daniel. 2006. "The Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduate Rates." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77 (6): 1081-1103.
- Jaeger, Audrey. 2008. "Contingent Faculty and Student Outcomes." *Academe* 94 (6).
- Jaeger, Audrey and Kevin Eagan. 2010. "Examining Retention and Contingent Faculty Use in a State System of Public Higher Education." *Educational Policy* 20 (10): 1-31.
- _____. 2009. "Unintended Consequences: Examining the Effect of Part-Time Faculty Members on Associate's Degree Completion." *Community College Review* 36 (3):167-194.
- Jamrisko, Michelle and Ilan Kolet. 2012. "Cost of College Degree in U.S. Soars 12 Fold: Chart of the Day." *Bloomberg*, August 15. At <bloomberg.com/news/2012-08-15/cost-of-college-degree-in-u-s-soars-12-fold-chart-of-the-day.html>
- Jarecki, Henry and Daniela Kaisth. 2009. *Scholar Rescue in the Modern World*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Jaschik, Scott. 2011. "Ethos Matters." *Inside Higher Ed*, February 1.
- _____. 2010. "He Won't Censor Himself." *Inside Higher Ed*, December 16.
- Jaspers, Karl. 1959. *The Idea of the University*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Jefferson, Thomas. 1779. "A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge." At <etext.virginia.edu/etcbin/toccernew2?id=JefPap.rsgm&images=images/modeng&data=/texts/english/modeng/parsed&tag=public&part=5&division=div1>
- Jiang, Xiaoping. 2008. "Towards the Internationalisation of Higher Education from a Critical Perspective." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 32 (4): 347-358.
- Johnson, Andy. 2012. "Student Suing Concordia University over Grade." *CTV News*, November 12.
- Johnson, Benjamin. 2010. "The Ethics of Corporatization: Competing Visions for University Leadership." *Philosophical Studies in Education* 41: 95-105.
- Johnson, Benjamin Heber. 2003. "The Drain-O of Higher Education: Casual Labor and University Teaching." In B. Johnson, P. Kavanagh and K. Mattson (eds.), *Steal This University: The Rise of the Corporate University and the Academic Labor Movement*. New York: Routledge.

- Johnson, Benjamin, Patrick Kavanagh and Kevin Mattson (eds.). 2003. *Steal This University: The Rise of the Corporate University and the Academic Labor Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnstone, Bruce D. 1998. *The Financing and Management of Higher Education: A Status Report on Worldwide Reforms*. Paper submitted to the UNESCO World Conference on Higher Education, Paris, France.
- Jones, Glen. 1998. "The Idea of a Canadian University." *Interchange* 29 (1): 69-80.
- _____. 1990. "Imminent Disaster Revisited, Again: The Crisis Literature of Canadian Higher Education." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 20 (2): 1-4.
- Jones, Glen, Patricia McCarney and Michael Skolnik (eds.). 2005. *Creating Knowledge, Strengthening Nations: The Changing Role of Higher Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jones, Glen, Theresa Shanahan and Paul Goyan. 2004. "The Academic Senate and University Governance in Canada." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 34 (2): 35-68.
- _____. 2001. "University Governance in Canadian Higher Education." *Tertiary Education and Management* 7 (2): 135-148.
- Jones, Glen, Julian Weinrib, Amy Scott Metcalfe, Don Fisher, Kjell Rubenson and Iain Snee. 2012. "Academic Work in Canada: The Perceptions of Early-Career Academics." *Higher Education Quarterly* 66 (2): 189-206.
- Jones, Glen and Stacey Young. 2004. "'Madly off in All Directions': Higher Education, Marketisation and Canadian Federalism." In P. Teixeira, B. Jongbloed, D. Dill and A. Amaral. (eds.), *Markets in Higher Education: Rhetoric or Reality?* Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Junor, Sean, Miriam Kramer and Alex Usher. 2006. "Apples to Apples: Towards a Pan-Canadian Common University Data Set." Toronto: Educational Policy Institute.
- Kachur, Jerrold. 2003. "Whose Intellectual Property? Whose Rights? GATS, TRIPS and Education in Canada." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 1 (3): 375-411.
- Kaminer, Ariel. 2013. "New Cornell Technology School Tightly Bound to Business." *The New York Times*, January 21.

- Kachur, Jerrold. 2003. "Whose Intellectual Property? Whose Rights? GATS, TRIPS and Education in Canada." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 1 (3): 375-411.
- Katz, Michael. 1986. "The Moral Crisis of the University, Or, the Tension Between Marketplace and Community in Higher Learning." In W. Neilson and C. Gaffield (eds.), *Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty-First Century*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- _____. 1971. *Class, Bureaucracy and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America*. New York: Praeger.
- _____. 1968. *The Irony of Early School Reform*. Boston: Beacon.
- Kaufman, Pamela, Joanna Cohen, Mary Jane Ashley, Roberta Ferrence, Alison Halyk, Fernand Turcotte, Kenneth Kyle and Donna Stewart. 2004. "Tobacco Industry Links to Faculties of Medicine in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 95 (3): 205-208.
- Keeney, Patrick. 2011. "Don't Turn Universities into Trade Schools." *National Post*, August 18.
- Kennedy, Kaley. 2010. "Sweatshop U: Part-Time, Precarious Work Becoming the Norm at Canadian Universities." At <halifax.mediacoop.ca/story/sweatshop-u/4634>
- Kerr, Clark. 2001. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kezar, Adrianna. 2004. "Obtaining Integrity? Reviewing and Examining the Charter between Higher Education and Society." *The Review of Higher Education* 27 (4): 429-459.
- Kim, Dongbin. 2007. "The Effect of Loans on Students' Degree Attainment: Differences by Student and Institutional Characteristics." *Harvard Educational Review* 77 (1): 64-100.
- Kimball, Roger. 1990. *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*. New York: Harper and Row.
- King, Ralph. 1999. "Medical Journals Rarely Disclose Researchers' Ties, Drawing Ire." *The Wall Street Journal*, February 2.

- King, Alan, Wendy Warren and Sharon Miklas. 2004. "Study of Accessibility to Ontario Law Schools." Kingston: Social Program Evaluation Group, Queen's University.
- Kirkham, Chris. 2012. "For-Profit Colleges Get Scathing Indictment in Senate Report." *The Huffington Post*. At <huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/30/for-profit-colleges-senate-report_n_1721058.html>
- Kirp, David. 2003. *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Klein, Seth. 2006. "The Importance of Public Post-Secondary Education." Vancouver: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Kleinman, Daniel and Steven Vallas. 2001. "Science, Capitalism, and the Rise of the 'Knowledge Worker': The Changing Structure of Knowledge Production in the United States." *Theory and Society* 30 (4): 451-492.
- Knight, Jane. 2008. "The Internationalization of Higher Education: Are We on the Right Track?" *Academic Matters*, October/November.
- Krimsky, Sheldon. 2008. "When Sponsored Research Fails the Admissions Test: A Normative Framework." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. 2003. *Science in the Private Interest: Has the Lure of Profits Corrupted Biomedical Research?* New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Krimsky S., L.S. Rothenberg, P. Stott and G. Kyle. 1996. "Financial Interests of Authors in Scientific Journals: A Pilot Study of 14 Publications" *Science and Engineering Ethics* 2 (3): 395-410.
- Kadushin, Charles. 1974. *The American Intellectual Elite*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Kurasawa, Fuyuki. 2002. "Which Barbarians at the Gate? From the Culture Wars to Market Orthodoxy in the North American Academy." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39 (3): 323-347.

- Kwong, Jeff, Irfan Dhalla, David Streiner, Ralph Baddour, Andrea Waddell, Ian Johnson. 2002. "Effects of Rising Tuition Fees on Medical School Class Composition and Financial Outlook." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 166 (8): 1023-1028.
- Labi, Aisha. 2009. "British Professors Protest Plan to Promote Socially Useful Research." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 16.
- Lacasse, Jeffrey and Jonathan Leo. 2010. "Ghostwriting at Elite Academic Medical Centers in the United States." *PLoS Medicine* 7 (2): e1000230.
- Ladd, Everett Carl and Seymour Martin Lipset. 1975. *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ladurantaye, Steve. 2010. "Universities Team up with Private Sector to Solve Student Housing Woes." *Globe and Mail*, July 14.
- Lafrance, Xavier. 2010. "The Battle of York." *New Socialist*, September 1. At <
newsocialist.org
/webzine/analysis/264-the-battle-of-york>
- Lakehead University. 2009. "Strategic Plan 2010-2013." At
<communications.lakeheadu.ca/uploads/docs/strategic-plan/Strategic_Plan_2010-2013_-_Final.pdf>
- Lambert-Chan, Marie. 2013. "Co-Authors of Retracted Papers Suffer Serious Career Consequences." *University Affairs*, August 7.
- Landry, Réjean, Nabil Amara and Imad Rherrad. 2006. "Why Are Some University Researchers More Likely to Create Spin-Offs than Others? Evidence from Canadian Universities." *Research Policy* 35 (10): 1599-1615.
- Lang, Daniel. 2005. "The Political Economy of Performance Funding." In F. Iacobucci and C. Tuohy (eds.), *Taking Public Universities Seriously*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Langford, Cooper, Jeremy Hall, Peter Josty, Stelvia Matos and Astrid Jacobson. 2006. "Indicators and Outcomes of Canadian University Research: Proxies Becoming Goals?" *Research Policy* 35 (10): 1586-1598.

- Larrabure, Manuel and Carlos Torchia. 2011. “‘Our Future is Not for Sale’: The Chilean Student Movement Against Neoliberalism.” *The Bullet*, Socialist Project E-Bulletin No. 542, September 6.
- Larsen, Mike and Kevin Walby. 2012. “Introduction: On the Politics of Access to Information.” In M. Larsen and K. Walby (eds.), *Brokering Access: Power, Politics, and Freedom of Information Process in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Lavars, Nick. 2012. “Students Propose Another Plan for Free Education in Chile.” *The Santiago Times*, March 5.
- Lavoie, Marie. 2009. “Harmonising Higher Education and Innovation Policies: Canada from an International Perspective.” *Higher Education Quarterly* 63 (1): 3-28.
- Lazaridis, Mike. 2004. “The Importance of Basic Research.” Keynote Address at the Fourth Annual RESEARCH MONEY Conference, November 9.
- Lea, Russ. 2010. “BP, Corporate R&D, and the University.” *Academe* 96 (6).
- Lebeau, Louis-Michel, Marie-Claude Laframboise, Vincent Larivière and Yves Gingras. 2008. “The Effect of University-Industry Collaboration on the Scientific Impact of Publications: The Canadian Case, 1980-2005.” *Research Evaluation* 17 (3): 227-232.
- Lee, Jenny and Robert Rhoads. 2004. “Faculty Entrepreneurialism and the Challenge to Undergraduate Education at Research Universities.” *Research in Higher Education* 45 (7): 739-760.
- Leslie, David. “Resolving the Dispute: Teaching is Academe’s Core Value.” *The Journal of Higher Education* 73 (1): 49-73.
- Lesser, Lenard, Cara Ebbeling, Merrill Goozner, David Wypij and David Ludwig. 2007. “Relationship between Funding Source and Conclusion among Nutrition-Related Scientific Articles.” *PLoS Medicine* 4(1): e5.
- Levine, Arthur and Diane Dean. 2012. *Generation on a Tightrope: A Portrait of Today’s College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levy, Sheldon. 2011. “Innovation and Entrepreneurship: A New Direction for Universities.” Speech to the Economic Club of Canada, November 2.

- Lexchin, Joel. 2010. "Ontario's Big Pharma Drug War." *The Bullet*, Socialist Project E-Bulletin No. 342, April 19.
- Lexchin, Joel, Lisa Bero, Benjamin Djulbegovic and Otavio Clark. 2003. "Pharmaceutical Industry Sponsorship and Research Outcome and Quality: Systematic Review." *British Medical Journal* 326: 1167-1170.
- Lin, Jane. 2006. "The Teaching Profession: Trends from 1999 to 2005." Statistics Canada, *Education Matters* 3 (4), Catalogue No. 81-004-XIE.
- Lippmann, Walter. 1922. *Public Opinion*. New York: MacMillan.
- Liu, Shuping, Ursula McCloy and Lindsay DeClou. 2012. "Early Labour Market Outcomes of Ontario College and University Graduates, 1982-2005." Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Livingstone, D.W. 1999. *The Education-Jobs Gap: Underemployment or Economic Democracy*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- _____. 1996. "Wasted Education and Withered Work: Reversing the 'Postindustrial' Education-Jobs Optic." In T. Dunk, S. McBride and R Nelsen (eds.), *The Training Trap: Ideology, Training and the Labour Market*. Winnipeg/Halifax: Society for Socialist Studies and Fernwood Publishing.
- _____. 1985. *Social Crisis and Schooling*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- London, Herbert. 1993. "Introduction." In J. Barzun, *The American University: How it Runs, Where it is Going*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2nd edition).
- Loveys, Kate. 2011. "Universities Axe 5,000 'Soft-Degree Courses' as Funding Cuts Sink In." *Daily Mail*, November 21.
- Loxley, John. 2010. *Public Service, Private Profits: The Political Economy of Public-Private Partnerships in Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Luong, May. 2010. "The Financial Impact of Student Loans." Statistics Canada, *Perspectives on Labour and Income* 11 (1), Catalogue No. 75-001-X.

- Lustig, Jeff. 2000. "Perils of the Knowledge Industry: How a Faculty Union Blocked an Unfriendly Takeover." In G. White (ed.), *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- MacAulay, James. 1984. *The Machine in the Garden: The Advent of Industrial Research Infrastructure in the Academic Milieu*. Ottawa: Science Council of Canada.
- MacDonald, Moira. 2013. "Sessionals, Up Close." *University Affairs*, January 9.
- Macdonald, David and Erika Shaker. 2012. "Eduflation and the High Cost of Learning." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- _____. 2011. "Under Pressure: The Impact of Rising Tuition Fees on Ontario Families." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- MacGregor, Karen. 2013. "Concerns Growing over 'Gaming' in University Rankings." *University World News* 277, June 23.
- Mackenzie, Hugh. 2012. "Canada's CEO Elite 100: The 0.01%." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- _____. 2005. "The Tuition Trap." Toronto: Hugh Mackenzie & Associates.
- Malcolmson, John and Marc Lee. 2004. "Financing Higher Learning: Post-Secondary Education Funding in BC." Vancouver: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Mandel, David. 2009. "The Struggle has its Own Dynamic: The Professors' Strike at the Université du Québec à Montréal." *The Bullet, Socialist Project E-Bulletin* No. 223, June 4.
- Mangan, Katherine. 2007. "Medical Schools See Many Ties to Industry." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 26.
- Mangaroo, Kelvin. 2012. "Back to School Reality CHEQUE." At < ratesupermarket.ca/blog/back-to-school-reality-cheque/>
- Marcucci, Pamela and Alex Usher. 2012. *2011 Year in Review: Global Changes in Tuition Fee Policies and Student Financial Assistance*. Toronto: Higher Education Strategy Associates.
- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Marginson, Simon. 2012. "Yes, MOOC is the Global Higher Education Game Changer." *University World News* 234, August 12.
- _____. 2011. "Higher Education and Public Good." *Higher Education Quarterly* 65 (4): 411-433.
- _____. 2010. "The Rise of the Global University: 5 New Tensions." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 30.
- _____. 2009. "Notes on Globalization and Higher Education: With Some Reference to the Case of Australia." In R. Trilokekar, G. Jones and A. Shubert (eds.), *Canada's Universities Go Global*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. 2007. "Globalisation, the 'Idea of a University' and its Ethical Regimes." *Higher Education Management and Policy* 19 (1): 1-15.
- Marginson, Simon and Mark Considine. 2000. *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission. 2007. "Two Years On: A Survey of Class 2003 Maritime University Graduates." Fredericton.
- Market Quest Research Group. 2005. "Survey of 2002 New Brunswick High School Graduates." Fredericton: Department of Training and Employment Development and the Department of Education.
- Marks, Denton. 2007. "The Unsettled Meaning of Undergraduate Education in a Competitive Higher Education Environment." *Higher Education in Europe* 32 (2/3): 174-183.
- Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission. 2008. "Intentions of Maritime University Students Following Graduation." Fredericton, NB: Maritime Provinces Higher Education Commission
- Mars, Matthew, Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades. 2008. "The State-Sponsored Student Entrepreneur." *The Journal of Higher Education* 79 (6): 638-670.
- Marseilles, Makki. 2011. "Protests Erupt Over Higher Education Reforms." *University World News* 187, September 4.
- Marshall, Chris. 2012. "Scottish Students Risk Losing Out Amid Flood of Applications from EU." *The Scotsman*, November 21.

- Marshall, Dave. 2008. "Differentiation by Degrees: System Design and the Changing Undergraduate Environment in Canada." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 38 (3).
- Martin, Eric and Simon Tremblay-Pepin. 2011. "Do We Really Need to Raise Tuition Fees? Eight Misleading Arguments for the Hikes." Montreal: IRIS. At <iris-recherche.qc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Brochure-English-web.pdf>
- Maslen, Geoff. 2012a. "Worldwide Student Numbers Forecast to Double by 2025." *University World News* 209, February 19.
- _____. 2012b. "More than Half of Tertiary Teaching Done by Casuals." *University World News* 227, June 21.
- _____. 2012c. "The Rise of the Multinational University." *University World News* 233, August 5.
- _____. 2010. "Majority of Academics are Casual." *University World News* 151, December 12.
- Massy, William and Robert Zemsky. 1995. "Using Information Technology to Enhance Academic Productivity." At <net.educause.edu/ir/library/html/nli0004.html>
- Matthews, David. 2013. "Marketing Up, Applications Down." *Inside Higher Ed*, February 7.
- Maxwell, Judith and Stephanie Currie. 1984. *Partnership for Growth: Corporate-University Cooperation in Canada*. Montréal: Corporate-Higher Education Forum.
- Mazurkewich, Karen. 2011. "Confronting Canada's Innovation Gap." At <opencanada.org/news/op-eds/confronting-canadas-innovation-gap/>
- McAlexander, Harry and Harold Koenig. 2010. "Contextual Influences: Building Brand Community in Large and Small Colleges." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 20 (1): 69-84.
- McElroy, Lori. 2005. "Student Aid and University Persistence: Does Debt Matter?" Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- McGrath, Earl. 1936. "The Control of Higher Education in America." *Educational Record* 17: 259-272.
- McLaren, Peter. 1986. *Schooling as a Ritual Performance: Towards a Political Economy of Educational Symbols and Gestures*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- McMahon, Walter. 2009. *Higher Learning, Greater Good: The Private and Social Benefits of Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- McMullen, Kathryn and Angelo Elias. 2011. "A Changing Portrait of International Students in Canadian Universities." Statistics Canada, *Education Matters* 7 (6), Catalogue No. 81-004-XIE.
- McMurtry, John. 2010. "Beyond Market Self-Serving: Recovering the Academy's Vocation." In J. Newson and C. Polster (eds.), *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- _____. 2009. "The Corporate Administration vs. the Vocation of Learning." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor, July/August.
- _____. 2004. "Reclaiming the Teaching Profession: From Corporate Hierarchy to the Authority of Learning." In D. Doherty-Delorme and E. Shaker (eds.), *Missing Pieces V: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- _____. 1991. "Education and the Market Model." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 25 (2): 209-217.
- McQuaig, Linda and Neil Brooks. 2010. *The Trouble With Billionaires*. Toronto: Viking Canada.
- Mearsheimer, John and Stephen Walt. 2007. *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Toronto: Viking Canada.
- Mennie, James, Katherine Wilton, Andy Riga, Chris Curtis, Max Harrold, Roberto Rocha and Jan Ravensbergen. 2012. "Peaceful Day March, Heated Night Demo." *Montreal Gazette*, May 23.
- Merton, Robert. 1973. *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Messer, Ellen. 1993. "Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education." *Social Text* 36: 40-80.
- Metcalfe, Amy Scott. 2010. "Revisiting Academic Capitalism in Canada: No Longer the Exception." *The Journal of Higher Education* 81 (4): 489-514.
- Metlay, Grischa. 2006. "Reconsidering Renormalization: Stability and Change in 20th-Century Views on University Patents." *Social Studies of Science* 36 (4): 565-597.

- Michael, Steve and Edward Holdaway. 1992. "Entrepreneurial Activities in Postsecondary Education." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 22 (2): 15-40.
- Migdal, Alex. 2013. "University of Alberta Suspends Admission to 20 Arts Programs." *Edmonton Journal*, August 19.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2003. "Globalization and the Geopolitics of Knowledge: The Role of the Humanities in the Corporate University." *Views from South* 4 (1): 97-119.
- Miliband, Ralph. 1969. *The State in Capitalist Society*. London: Quartet Books.
- Millet, Catherine. 2003. "How Undergraduate Loan Debt Affects Application and Enrollment in Graduate or First Professional School." *The Journal of Higher Education* 74 (4): 386-427.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1963. "The Social Role of the Intellectual." In I. Horowitz (ed.), *Power, Politics and People: The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Milway, James. 2005. "Post-Secondary Education and Ontario's Prosperity." In F. Iacobucci and C. Tuohy (eds.), *Taking Public Universities Seriously*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Miner, Rick. 2010. *People Without Jobs, Jobs Without People: Ontario's Labour Market Future*. Toronto: Miner Management Consultants.
- Minsky, Leonard. 2000. "Dead Souls: The Aftermath of Bayh-Dole." In G. White (ed.), *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Mirowski, Philip and Robert Van Horn. 2005. "The Contract Research Organization and the Commercialization of Scientific Research." *Social Studies of Science* 35 (4): 503-548.
- Molesworth, Mike, Elizabeth Nixon and Richard Scullion. 2009. "Having, Being and Higher Education: The Marketisation of the University and the Transformation of the Student into Consumer." *Teaching in Higher Education* 14 (3): 277-287.
- Montpetit, Jonathan. 2011. "Quebec to Fine McGill for Hiking MBA Tuition Fees Nearly 900 Percent." *Globe and Mail*, March 1.

- Moore, Malcolm. 2011. "Top Chinese University Accused of Selling Out." *The Telegraph*, May 29.
- Morgan, Matthew. 2010. "University of Ottawa Spied on Leading Burmese Activist." *Rabble.ca*, May 14. At <rabble.ca/news/2010/05/university-ottawa-spied-leading-burmese-activist>
- Morrison, Sarah and Brian Brady. 2011. "Student Debt Will Soar to \$200bn, Official Figures Show." *The Independent*, August 21.
- Moser, Richard. 2001. "The New Academic Labor System." At <aaup.org/AAUP/issues/contingent/moserlabor.htm>
- Motte, Anne and Saul Schwartz. 2009. "Are Student Employment and Academic Success Linked?" Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Motte, Anne, Joseph Berger and Andrew Parkin. 2009. "Paying for Post-Secondary Education." In J. Berger, A. Motte and A. Parkin (eds.), *The Price of Knowledge: Access and Student Finance in Canada*. Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Mount, Joan and Charles Bélanger. 2001. "'Academic Inc.': The Perspective of University Presidents." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 31 (2): 135-165.
- Mouwen, Kees. 2000. "Strategy, Structure and Culture of the Hybrid University: Toward the University of the 21st Century." *Tertiary Education and Management* 6 (1): 47-56.
- Mueller, Richard. 2008. "Access and Persistence of Students from Low-Income Backgrounds in Canadian Post-Secondary Education: A Review of the Literature." A MESA Project Research Paper. Toronto: Educational Policy Institute.
- Mullen, John. 2009. "Universities Exploding in Anger." *University World News* 73, April 26.
- Munro, Margaret. 2009. "Scientists Protest Appointment of Pfizer Boss to Health Panel." *Montreal Gazette*, December 7
- Murray, Fiona and Scott Stern. 2007. "Do Formal Intellectual Property Rights Hinder the Free Flow of Scientific Knowledge? An Empirical Test of the Anti-Commons Hypothesis." *Journal of Economic Behaviour & Organization* 63: 648-687.

- Muzzin, Linda, 2008. "How Fares Equity in an Era of Academic Capitalism? The Role of Continent Faculty." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Myklebust, Jan. 2010. "University Chancellor Resigns." *University World News* 128, June 13.
- Nadeau, Mary-Jo and Alan Sears. "This is What Complicity Looks Like: Palestine and the Silencing Campaign on Campus." *The Bullet*, Socialist Project E-Bulletin No. 475, March 5.
- Naidoo, Rajani and Ian Jamieson. 2005. "Empowering Participants or Corroding Learning? Towards a Research Agenda on the Impact of Student Consumerism in Higher Education." *Journal of Education Policy* 20 (3): 267-281.
- Nature editorial. 1997. "Avoid Financial 'Correctness.'" *Nature* 385 (6616): 469.
- Naylor, David. 2013. "Fending Off University-Attacking Zombies." *Financial Post*, March 14.
- _____. 2006. "The Trouble With Maclean's." *Ottawa Citizen*, April 22.
- Nearing, Scott. 1917. "Who's Who Among College Trustees." *School and Society* 6: 297-299.
- Neatby, Blair. 1985. "The Academic Profession: An Historical Perspective – 'Communities of Scholars in Ontario.'" In *The Professoriate – Occupation in Crisis*. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Neill, Christine. 2009. "Tuition Fees and the Demand for University Places." *Economics of Education Review* 28 (5): 561-570.
- Nelsen, Randle. 2002. *Schooling as Entertainment: Corporate Education Meets Popular Culture*. Kingston: Cedar creek.
- _____. (ed.). 1997a. *Inside Canadian Universities: Another Day at the Plant*. Kingston: Cedar creek.
- _____. 1997b. "Reading, Writing and Relationships among the Electronic Zealots: Distance Education and the Traditional University." In R. Nelsen (ed.), *Inside Canadian Universities: Another Day at the Plant*. Kingston: Cedar creek.
- Nelson, Cary. 2010. *No University is an Island: Saving Academic Freedom*. New York: New York University Press.

- _____. (ed.). 1997. *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nestle, Marion. 2007. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Neufeldt, Tim. 2009. "Formalizing Privacy Protection: FIPPA, Ontario Universities, and Unsupervised Records Management." *Faculty of Information Quarterly* 1 (2): 1-12.
- Newman, John Henry. 1852. *The Idea of a University*. [Quotes taken from New York: Doubleday, 1959].
- Newson, Janice. 2010. "Recovering the University as a Collective Project." In J. Newson and C. Polster (eds.), *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- _____. 1998. "The Corporate-Linked University: From Social Project to Market Force." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 23 (1).
- _____. 1994. "Subordinating Democracy: The Effects of Fiscal Retrenchment and University-Business Partnerships on Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Dissemination in Universities." *Higher Education* 27 (2): 141-161.
- _____. 1992. "The Decline of Faculty Influence: Confronting the Effects of the Corporate Agenda." In W. Carroll, L. Christiansen-Ruffman, R. Currie and D. Harrison (eds.), *Fragile Truths: Twenty-five Years of Sociology and Anthropology in Canada*. Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Newson, Janice and Claire Polster. 2010. *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- _____. 2008. "Reclaiming Our Centre: Toward a Robust Defence of Academic Autonomy." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Newson, Janice and Howard Buchbinder. 1988. *The University Means Business: Universities, Corporations and Academic Work*. Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Ng, Irene and Jeannie Forbes. 2009. "Education as Service: The Understanding of University Experience Through the Service Logic." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 19: 38-64.
- Nilsen, Kirsti. 2001. *The Impact of Information Policy: Measuring the Effects of the Commercialization of Canadian Government Statistics*. Westport, CT: Albex Publishing.

- Niosi, Jorge. 2006. "Success Factors in Canadian Academic Spin-Offs." *Journal of Technology Transfer* 31: 451-457.
- Nisbet, Robert. 1971. *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: The University in America, 1945-1970*. New York: Basic Books.
- Noble, David. 2007. "Mamdouh's Mandate: 'Mind to Market.'" At <archive.org/details/MamdouhsMandate-ByDavidFNoble>
- _____. 2005. "Private Pretensions: The Battle for Canada's Universities." *Canadian Dimension*, September/October.
- _____. 2001. *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____. 1977. *America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Novek, Joel. 1985. "University Graduates, Jobs and University-Industry Linkages." *Canadian Public Policy* 11 (2): 180-195.
- Nowotny, Helga, Peter Scott and Michael Gibbons. 2001. *Re-thinking Science: Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nutting, Maureen. 2003. "Part-Time Faculty: Why Should We Care." *New Directions for Higher Education* 123.
- Ohlendorf, Pat. 1985. "Industry's New Alliance with Universities." Report on Business Magazine, *Globe and Mail*, October 25.
- Olivieri, Nancy. 2000. "When Money and Truth Collide." In J. Turk (ed.), *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Omiecinski, Teresa. 2003. "Hiring of Part-Time University Faculty on the Increase." Statistics Canada, *Education Quarterly Review* 9 (3): 9-15.
- Ontario Chamber of Commerce. 2010. "Connect to Innovate: The Business-University Collaboration Imperative." At < cou.on.ca/issues-resources/key-issues/more/pdfs/connect-to-innovate-final-report.aspx>
- Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations. 2013. "Post-Secondary Education in Ontario: Managing Challenges in an Age of Austerity." At <

ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/OCUFA-Survey-2013-General-Results-Jan.-10-2013.pdf>

_____. 2012a. “OCUFA Analysis of the Drummond Report: Long on Cuts, Short on Insight.” At <ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/OCUFA-Drummond-Report-Analysis-Feb.-22-2012Final.pdf>

_____. 2012b. “2012 OCUFA Faculty Survey: Part 1 – Views on University Quality and Faculty Priorities.” At <ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/2012-OCUFA-Faculty-Survey-Part-1-Formatted-FINAL.pdf>

_____. 2012c. “2012 OCUFA Faculty Survey: Part 2 – Faculty Views on Proposed Changes to Undergraduate Education.” At <ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/Faculty-Survey-Part-2-Government-Proposals-FINAL.pdf>

_____. 2010a. “The Public Wisdom of Public Funding: Ontario Universities and the Recession.” Toronto.

_____. 2010b. “Investing in Students, Ensuring Success: Recommendations for a Meaningful Successor to Reaching Higher.” Toronto.

_____. 2010c. “The Decline of Quality at Ontario Universities: Shortchanging a Generation.” Toronto.

_____. 2009a. “The Business of Higher Education” UCUFA Research Reports. At <bit.ly/5bN9jH>

_____. 2009b. “Ontario University Faculty Sound Warning Over Declining Quality.” At <notes.ocufa.on.ca/OCUFARsrch.nsf/9da1693cdc3d700f852573db006561fc/66196466bf165ff9852576c100766ded?OpenDocument>

_____. 2006. “Performance Indicator Use in Canada, the U.S. and Abroad.” At <ocufa.on.ca/wordpress/assets/PI_Canada_and_abroad.pdf>

_____. 2004. “Restricted Entry: Access to Information at Ontario Universities.” *OCUFA Research Report 5* (4).

Opoku, Robert, Magnus Hultman and Esmail Saheli-Sangari. 2008. “Positioning in Market Space: The Evaluation of Swedish Universities’ Online Brand Personalities.” *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 18 (1): 124-144.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2012a. *Economic Survey of Canada 2012*. Paris: OECD.

_____. 2012b. *Education at a Glance 2012: OECD Indicators*. Paris: OECD

- _____. 2009. *Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard 2009*. Paris: OECD.
- Ornstein, Michael. 1988. "Corporate Involvement in Canadian Hospital and University Boards, 1946-1977." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 25 (3): 365-388.
- Orr, David. 2004. *Earth in Mind: On Education, Environment, and the Human Prospect*. Washington: Island Press.
- Orwell, George. 1945. Original introduction to *Animal Farm*. At orwell.ru/library/novels/Animal_Farm/english/efp_go
- Owram, Doug. 2010. "Fundraising for Neophytes." *University Affairs*, November 8.
- Ogrizek, Irene. 2013. "MOOCs Undermine the Public Higher Education Sector." *University World News* 273, May 25.
- Page, Stewart. 2012. "Final Observations of Canadian University Rankings: A Misadventure Now Over Two Decades Long." *Academic Matters*, November.
- Page, Stewart, Kenneth Cramer and Laura Page. 2010. "Canadian University Rankings: Buyer Beware Once Again." *Interchange* 41 (1): 81-89.
- Pagliaro, Jennifer. 2010. "Top CEOs Back McGill Tuition Hikes for Business Program." *Macleans*, May 10.
- Pakravan, Payam. 2006. "The Future Is Not What It Used to Be: Re-Examining Provincial Postsecondary Funding Mechanisms in Canada." C.D. Howe Institute Commentary, No. 227. Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute.
- Paton, Graeme. 2013. "University Fee Rise Sparks Surge in Demand for 'Jobs-Based' Degrees." *The Telegraph*, August 21.
- _____. 2012a. "Britain's First Profit-Making University Opened." *The Telegraph*, November 22.
- _____. 2012b. "More Russell Group Academics 'Earning Six-Figure Salaries.'" *The Telegraph*, April 19.
- _____. 2011a. "University Applications Drop Sharply after Tuition Fees Hike." *The Telegraph*, November 28.
- _____. 2011b. "Students 'Face Leaving University with £60K Debts.'" *The Telegraph*, August 12.

- Patton, Stacey. 2012. "The PhD Now Comes with Food Stamps." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 6.
- Paul, Ross. 2011. *Leadership Under Fire: The Challenging Role of the Canadian University President*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. 1992. *The Idea of the University: A Reexamination*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pennock, Lea, Glen Jones, Jeff Leclerc and Sharon Li. 2012. "Academic Senates and University Governance in Canada: Changes in Structure and Perceptions of Senate Members." Paper Presented at the Consortium of Higher Education Researchers, Belgrade, Serbia, September 10-12.
- Pestre, Dominique. 2003. "Regimes of Knowledge Production in Society: Towards a More Political and Social Reading." *Minerva* 41 (3): 245-261.
- Peters, Diane. 2013. "U of T Manages Backlash Against a Privately Run Residence." *University Affairs*, July 3.
- Phaneuf, Marie-Rose, Jonathan Lomas, Chris McCutcheon, John Church and Douglas Wilson. 2007. "Square Pegs in Round Holes: The Relative Importance of Traditional and Nontraditional Scholarship in Canadian Universities." *Science Communication* 28 (4): 501-518.
- Phillips, Shannon and Glen Hughes. 2004. "Trickle-Down Academics: University Policies and Alberta's Political Culture, 2002-03." In D. Doherty-Delorme and E. Shaker (eds.), *Missing Pieces V: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Pimlott, Herbert. 2013. "Laurier in Canada's Top Six Universities Employing the Largest Number of CAS." *WLUFU Advocate* 1 (4): 1.
- Pitas, Jeannine. 2010. "How Comparative Literature Was Saved at U of T: The Role of Student Activism." *Rabble.ca*, November 30. At <rabble.ca/blogs/bloggers/campus-notes/2010/11/how-comparative-literature-was-saved-u-t-role-student-activism>
- Pocklington, Tom and Allan Tupper. 2002. *No Place to Learn: Why Universities Aren't Working*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Polanyi, Michael. 1969. "The Republic of Science: Its Political and Economic Theory." In *Knowing and Being*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Polster, Claire. 2011. "Three Broken Promises: Some Consequences of Administrative Growth in Canadian Universities." *Our Schools, Our Selves* 21 (1): 139-156.
- _____. 2010. "Are We Losing Our Minds? Unreason in Canadian Universities Today." In J. Newson and C. Polster (eds.), *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- _____. 2008. "Waste Not, Want Not: Corporatization and 'Efficiency' in Canada's Universities." *Our Schools, Our Selves* 17 (2): 133-144.
- _____. 2007a. "The Nature and Implications of the Growing Importance of Research Grants to Canadian Universities and Academics." *Higher Education* 53 (5): 599-622.
- _____. 2007b. "Private Interests at Public Expense: Transforming Higher Education in Canada." In L. Samuelson and W. Antony (eds.), *Power and Resistance: Critical Thinking About Canadian Social Issues*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- _____. 2004. "Rethinking and Remaking Academic Freedom." In D. Doherty-Delorme and E. Shaker (eds.), *Missing Pieces V: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- _____. 2002. "A Break from the Past: Impacts and Implications of the Canada Foundation for Innovation and the Canada Research Chairs Initiatives." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 39 (3): 275-299.
- _____. 2000. "The Future of the Liberal University in the Era of the Global Knowledge Grab." *Higher Education* 39 (1): 19-41.
- _____. 1998. "From Public Resource to Industry's Instrument: Reshaping the Production of Knowledge in Canada's Universities." *Canadian Journal of Communications* 23 (1).
- Polster, Claire and Janice Newson. 2009. "What's Wrong with Corporatizing Canada's Universities? Plenty!" Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor, February.
- _____. 1998. "Don't Count Your Blessings: The Social Accomplishments of Performance Indicators." In Currie and Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*, London: Sage.

- Porter, Jane. 2006. "Financial Strains Keep Millions Out of College, Panel Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 22.
- Porter, John. 1965. *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Porter, John, Marion Porter and Bernard Blisshen. 1982. *Stations and Callings: Making it Through the School System*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Powell, Lewis. 1971. "Confidential Memorandum: Attack on American Free Enterprise System." At < greenpeace.org/usa/en/campaigns/global-warming-and-energy/polluterwatch/The-Lewis-Powell-Memo/>
- Prairie Research Associates. 2011. "2011 Undergraduate University Student Survey: Master Report." Ottawa: Canadian University Survey Consortium.
- _____. 2010. "2010 First-Year University Student Survey: Master Report." Ottawa: Canadian University Survey Consortium.
- _____. 2007a. "First-Year University Student Survey: Master Report 2007." Ottawa: Canadian University Survey Consortium.
- _____. 2007b. "Report on Student Debt: Canadian College Student Survey and Canadian Undergraduate Survey Consortium." Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- _____. 2004. "Survey of First-Year University Students: Master Report." Ottawa: Canadian University Survey Consortium.
- _____. 2002. "Survey of Undergraduate University Students: Master Report." Ottawa: Canadian University Survey Consortium.
- Pratt, Linda 1997. "Disposable Faculty: Part-Time Exploitation as Management Strategy." In C. Nelson (ed.), *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Press, Eyal and Jennifer Washburn. 2000. "The Kept University." *Atlantic Monthly* 285 (3): 39-54.
- Pritchard, Rosalind. 2005. "Relationships and Values among Students and Staff in British and German Higher Education." *Tertiary Education and Management* 11: 317-336.

- Pryor, John, Linda DeAngelo, Laura Blake, Sylvia Hurtado and Serge Tran. 2011. *The American Freshman: National Norms Fall 2011*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Puplampu, Korbla. 2004. "The Restructuring of Higher Education and Part-Time Instructors: A Theoretical and Political Analysis of Undergraduate Teaching in Canada." *Teaching in Higher Education* 9 (2): 171-182.
- Pupo, Norene. 1978. "The Postwar University in Canada and the Need for Skilled Labour: The Waterloo Example." In R. Nelsen and D. Nock (eds.), *Reading, Writing, and Riches: Education and the Socio-Economic Order in North America*. Toronto: Between the Lines.
- R.A. Malatest & Associates. 2007. "The Class of 2003: High School Follow-Up Survey." Montreal: Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation.
- Rae, Peter. 1996. "New Directions: Privatization and Higher Education in Alberta." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 26 (2): 59-80.
- Rai, Milan. 1995. *Chomsky's Politics*. Londo: Verso.
- Rajagopal, Indhu. 2004. "Tenuous Ties: The Limited-Term Full-Time Faculty in Canadian Universities." *The Review of Higher Education* 28 (1): 49-75.
- _____. 2002. *Hidden Academics: Contract Faculty in Canadian Universities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rajagopal, Indhu and William Farr. 1992. "Hidden Academics: The Part-Time Faculty in Canada." *Higher Education* 24 (3): 317-331.
- _____. 1989. "The Political Economy of Part-Time Academic Work." *Higher Education* 18 (3): 267-285.
- Ramasubramanian, Srividya, James Gyure and Nasreen Mursi. 2003. "Impact of Internet Images: Impression-Formation Effects of University Web Site Images." *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education* 12 (2): 49-68.
- Rauhvargers, Andrejs. 2013. "Global University Rankings and their Impact: Report II." Brussels: European University Association.

- Readings, Bill. 1996. *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reid, Tim and Julyan Reid (eds.). 1969. *Student Power and the Canadian Campus*. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates.
- Reimer, Marilee (ed.). 2004. *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out*. Toronto: Sumach Press.
- Reisberg, Liz. 2010. "Undocumented and Unsung – Growing Worldwide Dependence on Part-Time Faculty." *Inside Higher Ed*, November 8.
- Report of the Steering Committee on Resource Optimization to the University of Ottawa Administrative Committee. 2010. *Resource Optimization*. Ottawa. At site.uottawa.ca/school/eegsa/public_html/docs/resource-optimization-report.pdf
- Ridgeway, James. 2010. "Drug Pushers in Academia." *Mother Jones*, June 28.
- _____. 1968. *The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis*. New York: Random House.
- Rhoades, Gary. 2006. "The Higher Education We Choose: A Question of Balance." *The Review of Higher Education* 29 (3): 381-404.
- _____. 1998. *Managed Professionals: Reconstructing Academic Labor in Unionized Institutions*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Rhoades, Gary, Alma Maldonado-Maldonado, Imanol Ordorika and Martin Velazquez. 2004. "Imagining Alternativas to Global, Corporate, New Economy Academic Capitalism." *Policy Futures in Education*. 2 (2): 316-329.
- Rhoads, Robert and Carlos Torres (eds.). 2006. *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Riddell, Craig. 2005. "The Social Benefits of Education: New Evidence on an Old Question." In F. Iacobucci and C. Tuohy (eds.), *Taking Public Universities Seriously*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rinne, Risto. 1999. "The Rise of the McUniversity." In I. Fägerlind, I. Holmesland, and G. Strömqvist (eds.), *Higher Education at the Crossroads*. Stockholm: Institute of International Education, Stockholm University.

- Ritzer, George. 2002. "Enchanting McUniversity: Toward a Spectacularly Irrational University Quotidian." In D. Hayes and R. Wynyard (eds.), *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*. London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Robertson, Heather-Jane, David McGrane and Erika Shaker. 2003. "For Cash and Future Considerations: Ontario Universities and Public-Private Partnerships." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Robertson, Susan and Ruth Keeling. 2008. "Stirring the Lions: Strategy and Tactics in Global Higher Education." *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 6 (3): 221-240.
- Robin, Raizel. 2004. "Bright Ideas." *Canadian Business* 77 (3).
- Robinson, David. 2006. "The GATS: What's at Stake for Higher Education?" *Education Canada* 46 (4).
- Rodríguez, Victor. 2011. "Social Protest and the Future of Higher Education in Puerto Rico." *Academe* 97 (4).
- Rosell, Carlos and Ajay Agrawal. 2009. "Have University Knowledge Flows Narrowed? Evidence from Patent Data" *Research Policy* 38 (1): 1-13.
- Rosenstone, Steven. 2005. "Challenges Facing Higher Education in America: Lessons and Opportunities." In F. Iacobucci and C. Tuohy (eds.), *Taking Public Universities Seriously*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Rosyln Kunin & Associates. 2012. "Economic Impact of International Education in Canada – An Update: Final Report." At <international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/economic_impact_en.pdf>
- _____. 2009. "Economic Impact of International Education in Canada: Final Report." At <international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/RKA_IntEd_Report_eng.pdf>
- Ross, Andrew. 2000. "The Mental Labor Problem." *Social Text* 18 (2): 1-31.
- Ross, Murray. 1969. "The University and Modern Man." In A. Malik (ed.), *Social Foundations of Canadian Education*. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall.
- _____. 1966. *New Universities in the Modern World*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Roszak, Theodore. 1967. "On Academic Delinquency." In T. Roszak (ed.), *The Dissenting Academy*. New York: Pantheon.
- Rothaermel, Frank, Shanti Agung and Lin Jiang. 2007. "University Entrepreneurship: A Taxonomy of the Literature." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 16 (4): 691-791.

- Rothman, David, Walter McDonald, Carol Berkowitz, Susan Chimonas, Catherine DeAngelis, Ralph Hale, Steven Nissen, June Osborn, James Scully, Gerald Thomson and David Wofsy. 2009. "Professional Medical Associations and their Relationships with Industry: A Proposal for Controlling Conflict of Interest." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 301 (13): 1367-1372.
- Rowat, Donald. 1964. "The Business Analogy." In G. Whalley (ed.), *A Place of Liberty: Essays on the Government of Canadian Universities*. Toronto: Clarke and Irwin.
- _____. 1956. "The Government of Canadian Universities." *Culture* 17: 268-283.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1932. *Education and the Social Order*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- _____. 1926. *Education and the Good Life*. New York: Boni and Liveright.
- Ryerson, Egerton. 1847. *Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada*. Montreal: Lovell and Gibson.
- Said, Edward. 2004. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____. 1996. "Identity, Authority, and Freedom: The Potentate and the Traveler." In L. Menand (ed.), *The Future of Academic Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon.
- Salatka, William. 2013. "'They Make Cents': The Numbers Behind Contract Faculty: 'Value Versus Cost'" *WLUFAs Advocate* 1 (4): 7-8.
- Salmi, Jamil. 2009. *The Challenge of Establishing World Class Universities*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Salter, Ammon and Ben Martin. 2001. "The Economic Benefits of Publicly Funded Basic Research: A Critical Review." *Research Policy* 30 (3): 509-532.
- Saltmarsh, Sue. 2004. "Graduating Tactics: Theorizing Plagiarism as Consumptive Practice." *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 28 (4): 445-454.
- Sanders, Leslie. 2011. "Teaching-Stream Positions: Some Implications." COU Discussion Paper, No. 849. Toronto: Council of Ontario Universities.
- Sanburn, Josh. "Higher-Education Poll." TIME, October 18. At nation.time.com/2012/10/18/higher-education-poll/#ixzz2AnrV0lyW

- Schafer, Arthur. 2008. "The University as Corporate Handmaiden: Who're Ya Gonna Trust?" In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. 2004. "Biomedical Conflicts of Interest: A Defence of the Sequestration Thesis – Learning from the Cases of Nancy Olivieri and David Healy." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 30 (1): 8-24.
- Schibik, Timothy and Charles Harrington. 2002. "Part-Time Faculty Utilization and Departmental Academic Viability." *Department Chair* 13 (1): 17-19.
- Schmidt, Jeff. 2000. *Disciplined Minds: A Critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System that Shapes their Lives*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Schechter, Stephen. 1977. "Capitalism, Class and Educational Reform in Canada." In L. Panitch (ed.), *The Canadian State*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Schrecker, Ellen. 2010. *The Lost Soul of Higher Education: Corporatization, the Assault on Academic Freedom, and the End of the American University*. New York: The New Press.
- Schuetze, Hans and William Bruneau. 2004. "Less State, More Market: University Reform in Canada and Abroad." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 34 (3): 1-12.
- Schwartz, Saul. 1999. "The Dark Side of Student Loans: Debt Burden, Default, and Bankruptcy." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 37 (1&2): 307-338.
- Scott, John. 2006. "The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77 (1): 1-39.
- Sears, Alan. 2003. *Retooling the Mind Factory: Education in a Lean State*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Seidman, Karen. 2013a. "Suzanne Fortier, McGill's New President, at Centre of Debate." *Montreal Gazette*, March 23.
- _____. 2013b. "Universities Urged to Put Focus Back on Basic Research." *Montreal Gazette*, April 25.
- _____. 2012. "'We Make Your Papers Go Away': Website has Unemployed Profs Writing Students' Essays." *National Post*, September 12.

- Sellers, Charles. 1991. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815-1846*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Senate of Canada. 2011. "Opening the Door: Reducing Barriers to Post-Secondary Education in Canada." Ottawa: Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science and Technology.
- Serebrin, Jacob. 2010. "It's True. Teaching Takes a Back Seat to Research." *Maclean's*, November 14.
- Shaker, Erika. 2006. "Funding Issues and Universities." Presentation at CUPE National University Workers Meeting, Montreal. At <cupe.ca/research/Funding_Issues_and_U>
- _____. 1999. "The Privatization of Post-Secondary Institutions." *Education, Limited* 1 (4).
- Shanahan, Theresa. 2009. "An Overview of the Impetus to Accountability, its Expressions and Implications." In *Accounting or Accountability in Higher Education: Proceedings from the January 8, 2009 OCUFA Conference*. Toronto: Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations.
- _____. 2008. "The Political Economy of Legal Scholarship: A Case Study of the University of British Columbia Law School." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Shapiro, Ben. 2004. *Brainwashed: How Universities Indoctrinate America's Youth*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Sharma, Yojana. 2010. "Higher Education Conference Attacks Rankings." *University World News* 140, September 19.
- Shiple, Tyler. 2009. "Demanding the Impossible: Struggles for the Future of Post-Secondary Education." *The Bullet, Socialist Project E-Bulletin* No. 215, May 10.
- Shrimpton, Gordon. 1987. "The Crisis in Canadian Universities." In T. Wotherspoon (ed.), *The Political Economy of Canadian Schooling*. Toronto: Methuen.
- Shubert, Adrian, Glen Jones and Roopa Trilokekar. 2009. "Introduction." In R. Trilokekar, G. Jones and A. Shubert (eds.), *Canada's Universities Go Global*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.

- Side, Katherine and Wendy Robbins. 2007. "Institutionalizing Inequalities in Canadian Universities: The Canada Research Chairs Program." *Feminist Formations* 19 (3): 163-181.
- Simon, Stephanie and Stephanie Banchero. 2010. "Putting a Price on Professors." *The Wall Street Journal*, October 22.
- Siler, Kyle and Neil McLaughlin. 2008. "The Canada Research Chairs Program and Social Science Reward Structures" *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 45 (1): 93-119.
- Sinclair, Upton. 1923. *The Goose-Step: A Study of American Education*. Pasadena, CA: The Author.
- Singleton, Sharon. 2010. "Parents Can't Foot University Bill." *Toronto Sun*, September 23.
- Singleton-Jackson, Jill, Dennis Jackson and Jeff Reinhardt. 2010. "Students as Consumers of Knowledge: Are They Buying What We're Selling?" *Innovative Higher Education* 35 (5): 343-358.
- Sismondo, Sergio. 2009a. "Medical Publishing and the Drug Industry: Is Medical Science for Sale?" *Academic Matters*, May.
- _____. 2009b. "Ghosts in the Machine: Publication Planning in the Medical Sciences." *Social Studies of Science* 39 (2): 171-198.
- _____. 2008. "Pharmaceutical Company Funding and its Consequences: A Qualitative Systematic Review." *Contemporary Clinical Trials* 29: 109-113.
- _____. 2007. "Ghost Management: How Much of the Medical Literature is Shaped Behind the Scenes by the Pharmaceutical Industry?" *PLoS Medicine* 4 (9), e286: 1429-1433.
- Skolnik, Michael. 1988. Review of *The University Means Business*. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 18 (1): 80-82.
- Slaughter, Sheila. 1998. "National Higher Education Policies in a Global Economy." In J. Currie and J. Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Slaughter, Sheila and Larry Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades. 2008. "The Academic Capitalist Knowledge/Learning Regime." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- _____. 2004. *Academic Capitalism in the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Small, J.M. 1994. "Reform in Canadian Universities." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 24 (2): 1-15.
- Smallman, Vicky. 2004. "Contingent Academic Work in the Canadian Context." At <chicagococal.org/downloads/Unions-Canada.pdf>
- Smith, J. Percy. 1960. "University Government." *CAUT Bulletin* 8 (3).
- Smith, Richard. 2005. "Medical Journals Are an Extension of the Marketing Arm of Pharmaceutical Companies."
- Smith, Richard. 2005. "Medical Journals Are an Extension of the Marketing Arm of Pharmaceutical Companies." *PLoS Medicine* 2 (5): e138.
- Smith, Stuart. 1991. *Report: Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education*. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Smith, W.D. 2010. "Where all that Money is Going." *Maclean's*, January 14.
- Snider, Lauren. 2003. "Researching Corporate Crime." In S. Tombs and D. Whyte (eds.), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful: Scrutinizing States and Corporations*. New York: Peter Lang.
- _____. 2000. "The Sociology of Corporate Crime: An Obituary." *Theoretical Criminology* 4 (2): 169-206.
- Snowdon, Ken. 2005. "Without a Roadmap: Government Funding and Regulation of Canada's Universities and Colleges." Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Snowdon and Associates. 2009. *Revisiting Ontario College and University Revenue Data*. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. 2003. "From Granting Council to Knowledge Council: Renewing the Social Sciences and Humanities in Canada." Ottawa.

- Solty, Ingar. 2012. "Canada's 'Maple Spring:' From the Quebec Student Strike to the Movement Against Neoliberalism." *The Bullet*, Socialist Project E-Bulletin No. 752, December 31.
- Soo, Many and Cathryn Carson. 2004. "Managing the Research University: Clark Kerr and the University of California." *Minerva* 42 (3): 215-236.
- Speer, Lawrence. 2010. "Push Towards Innovative Funding Methods." *University World News* 142, September 15.
- Spring, Joel. 1986. *The American School, 1642-1985: Varieties of Historical Interpretation and the Foundations and Development of American Education*. New York: Longman.
- _____. 1972. *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stanford, Jim. 2001. "Education is Great, But It's No Guarantee of a Better Life." Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Monitor, October.
- Starfield, Barbara. 2000. "Is US Health Really the Best in the World?" *Journal of the American Medical Association* 284 (4):483-485.
- Statistics Canada. 2012. "University Tuition Fees, 2012/2013." *The Daily*, September 12. At <statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/120912/dq120912a-eng.pdf>
- _____. 2010a. "Education Indicators in Canada: An International Perspective." Ottawa. Catalogue No. 81-604-X.
- _____. 2010b. "Employment Patterns of Postsecondary Students." *The Daily*, September 29. At <statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100929/dq100929c-eng.htm>
- _____. 2010c. "University Enrolment." *The Daily*, July 14. At <www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/100714/dq100714a-eng.htm>
- _____. 2010d. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 2008*. Ottawa.
- _____. 2009a. "Labour Force Historical Review 2008." Ottawa. Catalogue No. 71FOOO4XCB.
- _____. 2009b. "Transitions to the Labour Market." Ottawa. Catalogue No. 81-599-X. Issue No. 002.

- _____. 2009c. "Postsecondary Enrolment and Graduation, October 2009." Ottawa. Catalogue No. 81-599-X. At <statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-599-x/81-599-x2009003-eng.htm>
- _____. 2005. "University Enrolment." *The Daily*, October 11. At <statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/051011/dq051011b-eng.htm>
- _____. 2000. *Survey of Intellectual Property Commercialization in the Higher Education Sector 1999*. Ottawa.
- Steck, Henry. 2003. "Corporatization of the University: Seeking Conceptual Clarity." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 585: 66-83.
- Steele, Ken. 2010. "Knowing Your Undergraduates." *Academic Matters*, October/November.
- Stelfox, Henry, Grace Chua, Keith O'Rourke and Allan Detsky. 1998. "Conflict of Interest in the Debate Over Calcium-Channel Antagonists." *New England Journal of Medicine* 338 (2): 101-106.
- Stewart, Penni. 2011. "Collaborations: Are Universities Sacrificing Integrity?" *CAUT Bulletin* 58 (5).
- _____. 2010. "Nothing Casual about Academic Work." *CAUT Bulletin* 57 (5).
- Street, Steve, Maria Maisto, Esther Merves and Gary Rhoades. 2012. "Who is Professor 'Staff'?" *Center for the Future of Higher Education*, Policy Report #2.
- Stripling, Jack. 2011. "Most Presidents Prefer No Tenure for Majority of Faculty." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 15.
- Students for a Democratic Society. 1962. "Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society, 1962" At <h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html>
- Sumner, Jennifer. 2008a. "Keeping the Commons in Academic Culture: Protecting the Knowledge Commons from the Enclosure of the Knowledge Economy." In A. Chan and D. Fisher (eds.), *The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- _____. 2008b. "From Academic Imperialism to the Civil Commons: Institutional Possibilities for Responding to the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development." *Interchange* 39 (1): 77-94.

- Svensson, Göran and Greg Wood. 2007. "Are University Students Really Customers? When Illusion May Lead to Delusion for all!" *International Journal of Educational Management* 21 (1): 17-28.
- Tamburri, Rosanna. 2012. "Full-Time Canadian Faculty Report High Job Satisfaction." *University Affairs*, June 6.
- _____. 2010. "Federal Granting Agencies Get More Appointees from Outside Academe." *University Affairs*, February 8.
- _____. 2008. "Canada Works on a Brand for Postsecondary Education." *University Affairs*, January 7.
- Tandem Social Research Consulting. 2007. *Literature Review of Postsecondary Education in Canada*. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, Canada.
- Tanguay, Denise. 2003. "Inefficient Efficiency: A Critique of Merit Pay." In B. Johnson, P. Kavanagh and K. Mattson (eds.), *Steal This University: The Rise of the Corporate University and the Academic Labor Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Tannock, Stuart. 2006. "Higher Education, Inequality, and the Public Good." *Dissent* 53 (2): 45-51.
- Task Force on Competitiveness, Productivity and Economic Progress. 2009. *Navigating Through the Recovery*. Toronto: Institute for Competitiveness and Prosperity.
- Tedesco, Theresa. 2012. "The Uneasy Ties Between Canada's Universities and Wealthy Business Magnates." *Financial Post*, March 9.
- Thompson, E. P. 1970. "The Business University." *New Society* 386: 301-304.
- Thompson, Jon. 2011. *No Debate: The Israeli Lobby and Free Speech at Canadian Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. 2008. "Academic Integrity and the Public Interest." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Thompson, Paul, Philippe Constantineau and George Fallis. 2006. "Academic Citizenship." Council of Ontario Universities Working Paper Series 5 (2).
- Tight, Malcolm. 2003. *Researching Higher Education*. Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

- Tombs, Steve and Dave Whyte. 2003. "Scrutinizing the Powerful: Crime, Contemporary Political Economy, and Critical Social Research." In S. Tombs and D. Whyte (eds.), *Unmasking the Crimes of the Powerful: Scrutinizing States and Corporations*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tomusk, Voldemar (ed.). 2006. *Creating the European Area of Higher Education: Voices from the Periphery*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Tremblay-Pepin, Simon. 2013. "Tuition Hike and the Media between 2005 and 2010 in Quebec." Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives. At behindthenumbers.ca/2013/02/14/tuition-hike-and-the-media-between-2005-and-2010-in-quebec/
- Tuchman, Gaye. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tudiver, Neil. 1999. *Universities for Sale: Resisting Corporate Control over Canadian Higher Education*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- Turk, James. 2009. "Low Blow from 'Top Five' Universities." *Toronto Star*, September 1.
- _____. (ed.). 2008a. *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. 2008b. "Restructuring Academic Work." In J. Turk (ed.), *Universities at Risk: How Politics, Special Interests and Corporatization Threaten Academic Integrity*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company.
- _____. (ed.). 2000. *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company
- Turner, David. 2010. "University Managers Outpace Academics." *Financial Times*, February 22.
- Tyers, Mike et al. 2005. "Problems with Co-Funding in Canada." *Science* 308 (5730): 1867.
- Umbach, Paul. 2007. "How Effective are They? Exploring the Impact of Contingent Faculty on Undergraduate Education." *The Review of Higher Education* 30 (2): 91-123.

- Universities Allied for Essential Medicines. 2013. “University Global Health Impact Report Card.” At <globalhealthgrades.org/>
- University of Guelph. 2008. “Strategic Research Plan.” At <uoguelph.ca/research/assets/policies/srp_2008/guelph_srp.pdf>
- University of Guelph Faculty Association. 2013a. “News & Views January 2013 – PPP.” At <ugfa.ca/userContent/documents/Newsletters/January2013.pdf>
- _____. 2013b. “News & Views January 2013 – PPP Financial.” At <ugfa.ca/userContent/documents/Newsletters/Jan_Financial_PPP.pdf>
- _____. 2013c. “AIC Committee and the PPP.” At <ugfa.ca/userContent/documents/Newsletters/feb_AIC_2013b.pdf>
- University of Toronto. 2010. “Memorandum of Agreement Between the Peter and Melanie Munk Charitable Foundation and the Governing Council at the University of Toronto.” At <individual.utoronto.ca/paul_hamel/Documents/Munk_MoA-Global_Affairs.pdf>
- _____. 2009. “By the Numbers: Excellence, Innovation, Leadership: Research at the University of Toronto 2009-2010 Research Report.” At <research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2008/02/UofT_by_the_numbers_2010.pdf>
- _____. 2008a. “Towards 2030: Task Force on Resources, Final Report.” At <towards2030.utoronto.ca/reports/tf_report_1.htm>
- _____. 2008b. “Towards 2030: A Third Century of Excellence at the University of Toronto, Synthesis Report.” At <towards2030.utoronto.ca/files/2030_REDUX_v7.pdf>
- _____. 2008c. “Towards 2030: Task Force on University Relations & Context, Final Report.” At <towards2030.utoronto.ca/files/2030%20Task%20Force%20on%20UR-C%20Report.pdf>
- _____. 2004. “Stepping UP: A Framework for Academic Planning 2004 to 2010. Companion Paper 4 – Faculty Support and Renewal.” At <provost.utoronto.ca/plans/framework/faculty.htm>

- Usher, Alex and Andrew Potter. 2006. "A State of the Field Review of Post-Secondary Education." Toronto: Canadian Council on Learning.
- Usher, Alex and Patrick Duncan. 2008. "Beyond the Sticker Shock: A Closer Look at Canadian Tuition Fees." Toronto: Educational Policy Institute.
- Vajoczki, Susan, Nancy Fenton, Karen Menard and Dawn Pollon. 2011. "Teaching Stream Faculty in Ontario Universities." Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.
- Vallas, Steven and Daniel Kleinman. 2008. "Contradiction, Convergence, and the Knowledge Economy: The Co-Evolution of Academic and Commercial Biotechnology." *Socio-Economic Review* 6 (2): 283-311.
- Vallance, Elizabeth. 1983. "Hiding the Hidden Curriculum: An Interpretation of the Language of Justification in Nineteenth-Century Educational Reform." In H. Giroux and D. Purpel (eds.), *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Valleau, John and Paul Hamel. 2010. "Idea and Reality: The University or the Universities." In J. Newson and C. Polster (eds.), *Academic Callings: The University We Have Had, Now Have, and Could Have*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Valpy, Michael. 2010. "Universities Bowed to Pressure by Balsillie-Funded Think Tank Over Academic Freedom, Report Says." *Globe and Mail*, October 29.
- Van de Bunt-Kokhuis, Sylvia. 2004. "Globalization and the Freedom of Knowledge." *Higher Education in Europe* 29 (2): 269-284.
- Van Loon, Richard. 2005. "Universities and Living Standards in Canada." *Canadian Public Policy* 31 (4): 405-411.
- Vasagar, Jeevan. 2010. "Tuition Fees Rise 'Contravenes Human Rights Law.'" *The Guardian* online. At <guardian.co.uk/education/2010/dec/16/tuition-fees-rise-contravenes-human-rights-law> December 16.
- Veblen, Thorstein. 1918. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: B.W. Huebsch [quotes taken from Kila, Montana: Kessinger, 2004].

- Vincent-Lancrin, Stéphan. 2006. "What is Changing in Academic Research? Trends and Future Scenarios." *European Journal of Education* 41 (2): 169-202.
- Vojak, Colleen. 2006. "What Market Culture Teaches Students About Ethical Behavior." *Ethics and Education* 1 (2): 177-195.
- von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 1963. *Humanist Without Portfolio: An Anthology of the Writings of Wilhelm von Humboldt*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Vossensteyn, Hans. 2009. "Challenges in Student Financing: State Financial Support to Students – A Worldwide Perspective." *Higher Education in Europe* 34 (2): 171-187.
- Walby, Kevin and Mike Larsen. 2012. "Access to Information and Freedom of Information Requests: Neglected Means of Data Production in the Social Sciences." *Qualitative Inquiry* 18 (1): 31-42.
- Walters, Joe. 2010. "Neo-Liberals Push University Privatisation." *University World News* 124, May 16.
- Washburn, Jennifer. 2010. "Big Oil Goes to College: An Analysis of 10 Research Collaboration Contracts between Leading Energy Companies and Major U.S. Universities." Washington, D.C.: Center for American Progress.
- _____. 2005. *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Webber, Michelle. 2008. "Miss Congeniality Meets the New Managerialism: Feminism, Contingent Labour, and the New University." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 38 (3): 37- 56.
- Weber, Max. 1946. "Science as a Vocation." In H. Gerth and C.W. Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wellen, Richard. 2005. "The University Student in a Reflexive Society: Consequences of Consumerism and Competition." *Higher Education Perspectives* 1 (2): 23-37.
- Westhues, Kenneth. 2009. "Ottawa's Dismissal of Denis Rancourt." At arts.uwaterloo.ca/~kwesthue/Rancourt09.htm

- _____. 2004. *Administrative Mobbing at the University of Toronto: The Trial, Degradation, and Dismissal of a Professor during the Presidency of J. Robert S. Prichard*. Queenston, ON: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Weston, Greg. 2013. "Peeved Harper Aims at 'Remaking Canadian Labour Force.'" *CBC News*, March 18.
- White, Geoffry. 2000. "Business School: An Interview with Noam Chomsky." In G. White (ed.), *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- White, Naomi. 2007. "The Customer is Always Right?: Student Discourses about Higher Education in Australia." *Higher Education* 54 (4): 593-604.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. 1967. *The Aims of Education*. New York: Basic Books [originally published in 1929].
- Williams, Jeffrey. 2012. "Academic Freedom and Indentured Students." *Academe* 98 (1).
- Williams, Rachel and Jeevan Vasagar. 2010. "University Tuition Fees Hike 'Will Deter Most Poorer Students' – Poll." *The Guardian*, November 18.
- Willinsky, John, Sally Murray, Claire Kendall and Anita Palepu. 2007. "Doing Medical Journals Differently: *Open Medicine*, Open Access, and Academic Freedom." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 32: 595-612.
- Wilson, Duff. 2010. "Drug Maker Hired Writing Company for Doctor' Book, Documents Say." *The New York Times*, November 29.
- Wilson, Fred. 2003. "Education as Economic Investment: Comments on Tuition Fee Policy." *Interchange* 34 (1): 89-104.
- Winchester, Ian. 1986. "The Future of a Mediaeval Institution: The University in the Twenty-First Century. In W. Neilson and C. Gaffield (eds.), *Universities in Crisis: A Mediaeval Institution in the Twenty-First Century*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.
- Windmiller, Marshall. 1967. "International Relations: The New American Mandarins." In T. Roszak (ed.), *The Dissenting Academy*. New York: Pantheon.
- Wolff, Robert. 1969. *The Ideal of the University*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Woodhouse, Howard. 2009. *Selling Out: Academic Freedom and the Corporate Market*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- _____. 1988. "Legitimation or Transformation: The Role of the State in University Education." In C. Watson (ed.), *Readings in Canadian Higher Education*. Toronto: The Higher Education Group.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1969. *University in Turmoil: The Politics of Change*. New York: Atheneum.
- Weber, Max. 1958. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- York University. 2012. "York University Factbook." At <yorku.ca/factbook/factbook.asp?Year=2011+-+2012>
- York University. 2010. "University Academic Plan 2010-2015: Enhancing Academic Quality in a Globalized World." York University Senate: Academic Policy, Planning and Research Committee.
- _____. 2005. "University Academic Plan, Academic Priorities 2005-2010." York University Senate: Academic Policy and Planning Committee.
- Zha, Qiang. 2010. "University Networks and the Global South" *University World News* 121, April 25.
- Zheng, Peijun. 2010. "The 'Second Academic Revolution': Interpretations of Academic Entrepreneurship." *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 40 (2): 35-50.
- Zinn, Howard. 2005. *Howard Zinn on Democratic Education*. London: Paradigm Publishers.