

THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC CAPITALISM ON ACADEMIC MANAGERS AT LAND
GRANT INSTITUTIONS IN THE SOUTHWEST UNITED STATES

A Dissertation

by

DANIEL VILLANUEVA, JR.

Submitted to the Graduate and Professional School of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Yvonna S. Lincoln
Committee Members,	Vicente Lechuga
	Glenda Musoba
	Ben D. Welch
Head of Department,	Mary Alfred

December 2021

Major Subject: Higher Education Administration

Copyright 2021 Daniel Villanueva, Jr.

ABSTRACT

This is a qualitative study that examined the impact of academic capitalism on academic managers at five land-grant universities located in the Southwest United States. This study included in-depth interviews of Presidents/Chancellors, Provost, and Academic Deans to gain insights into their perception of academic capitalism, neo-liberalism, faculty work-life, challenges associated with leading institutions during the twenty-first century, and the future of higher education. The study included observations, in-person visits to campus, participation in academic meetings, and interviews. The study concluded that the concept and overall impact of academic capitalism are not well understood among academic managers within the academy. In addition, three themes emerged from the study: the rise of educational entrepreneurship increased competitiveness and increased accountability from external constituents.

The findings conclude that higher education is managed as a nonprofit corporation, and the expanding oversight of every function of the university will continue to grow. In addition, academic managers within the study outlined skill sets future academic managers need in order to be successful. The implications of the study reveal reduced shared governance and collegiality within the academy. Every constituent group is impacted by the rise of academic capitalism. Board of Regents can learn about the impact that reduced stated funding has on institutional operations, the importance of academic managers leading sharing governance, and the need for professional development for future academic managers. Current administrators have a better understanding that the shift has created additional workload, increased audit trails, and molded a new culture of intrusive accountability to reign. Faculty and staff learn that there is a new working environment, and most internal and external constituents don't understand or acknowledge the new environment.

State legislatures can gain a better understanding of the impact of reduced state funding and the environment it shapes for higher education. Parents and students can better understand the rising cost of higher education while examining the best options for higher education. External influencers have redefined higher education and society has embraced a narrative that values higher education as a private good. Future research could also explore how, and whether, academic capitalism has impacted self-funded private, prestigious institutions.

DEDICATION

It is with sincere gratitude that I dedicate this work to Anna, Diego, and my parents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my committee chair, Dr. Yvonna S. Lincoln, and my committee members, Dr. Musoba, Dr. Lechuga, and Dr. Welch, for their guidance and support throughout this research.

Thank you to all the friends, colleagues, and the department faculty and staff for making my time at Texas A&M University a **great** experience. I could have never imaged this Red Raider would have fallen in love with Aggieland! This experience has forever changed my life.

Thank you to my parents Daniel Sr. and Elvira Villanueva. Growing up, my Dad told me there wasn't anything I couldn't do, and he still believes that today. He has been supportive of every thought, dream, or venture I've ever shared with him. He's the first to tell me, "you can do it, and I'll be there." He is a hard worker, funny, outgoing, and has many one-liners that consistently provide a deep perceptive on complex issues. Through his actions, he taught me how to advocate for myself, the value of humor and encouraged me always to keep going – no matter what!

My Mom is the most loving and caring person on the planet. She is a hard worker who has taken on more than anyone could imagine in this lifetime and finds time to smile and move forward. She often took me to work with her when I was a child, and through those memories, she shared the value of hard work and inspired me to understand that a Latina could lead. She's the best cook. My parents are my biggest cheerleaders. They worked so hard to give me every opportunity to succeed. I am forever indebted to both my parents. I love you.

My wife Anna married me when I made \$6.50 an hour as a call center representative at a pizza place in Lubbock, TX. She saw something in me that I couldn't see in myself. She is selfless, gracious, and the most beautiful soul I have ever met. She has given up so much over the last ten years and has stood by my side through all personal, professional, and academic challenges. I'm thankful as she took on so many life and family responsibilities during this time. She is my rock and my soulmate. I could not have done this without her – this is our degree!

My son Diego is perfect. We had him during this educational journey, and although I took a break to help raise him the first couple of years, he too experienced a time at which I had to commute to campus, fly to other states, and work on a dissertation. The fact that an eight-year-old knows what a dissertation is sheds light on his involvement. I hope he'll recognize that all my hard work had a generational impact one day. I have some peace in knowing that he won't be a first-generation college student and will navigate this world without the same challenges that I had to overcome. He is so much fun and is my partner in crime. He is my best friend.

I want to thank my mentors, who have provided so much insight to help get me to this point. My first professional mentor was Dr. John Harris, retired Vice President of Student Services at Blinn College. He hired me when I was too young to be a director and afforded me many professional opportunities that launched my career in higher education. I will never forget the many conversations about diversity, equity, and inclusion. He was the first to tell me I should look into a doctorate program.

Thank you to Dr. Audre Levy, retired President of Lone Star College-CyFair. She's made her life in and of education. She's a loyal friend and mentor. She gave me time off to travel for coursework and kindly reminded me every day that I needed to finish my doctorate for the last ten years. She, too, gave me so many professional advancements during my time at CyFair, and I

will forever be thankful for our friendship. She's one of a kind, dynamic, and a true testament to the power of higher education.

I want to thank Ed Hugetz, retired Provost at the University of Houston-Downtown. He is perhaps the most brilliant university administrator and intellect I've met. Ed hired me during this research study. He provided time for me to travel to conduct the research and became a dear friend. He was much more than a supervisor; he served as my sounding board for all things higher education and academic capitalism. Our engaging and intellectual conversations about academic capitalism and higher education shaped this research study.

I want to thank Dr. Juan Sanchez Muñoz, Chancellor of the University of California-Merced. Dr. Muñoz was the first Mexican-American male I ever met in higher education and served as my role model. As the former President at the University of Houston-Downtown, he guided me through many of my first university administration encounters. He provided time for me to study and travel for this research while serving as the Associate Vice President. His leadership, mentorship, and continued collaboration have transformed my personal and professional life.

There are too many colleagues to name in this section individually. Still, many took on additional work, covered the office, and represented me when I couldn't be on campus due to class or travel. I want to thank all of the colleagues who I've worked with at Blinn College, Lone Star College-CyFair, Lone Star College-North Harris, and the University of Houston-Downtown. I could not have done this without your support.

Laura Lyon and Brian Piscacek are close friends who often read the manuscript and provide critical writing feedback. Laura is a technical writing expert who helped me reconsider writing styles and word choice. Brian is my best friend and helped to grammatically correct every

inaccuracy. As an outsider of higher education, he made me think critically about organizational behavior. So many people offered to help, but in the end, you two came through time and time again.

Last but not least, I'd like to thank Dr. Lincoln. She started as my assigned chair and has become a life-long friend. She is the most brilliant scholar on Earth. 'The Queen' (as she is known in the higher education research world) is the best qualitative researcher alive. She is a demanding professor who is hysterically funny. She is simply the best person who could have guided me through this academic journey. I want to be like her when I grow up.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Yvonna S. Lincoln, advisor of the Department of Higher Education Administration Department.

All other work conducted for the thesis (or) dissertation was completed by the student independently.

Funding Sources

There was no outside financial support to complete the dissertation research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Progression of Academic Capitalism.....	2
Problem Statement.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW	10
Globalization.....	10
Neoliberal State.....	12
Academic Capitalism.....	15
Faculty Work-Life	17
Neoliberal State.....	12
Academic Capitalism.....	15
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	29
Five Axioms of the Naturalist Paradigm	31
Research Design.....	33
Data Collection	35
Data Analysis.....	41
Conclusion	42

	Page
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS.....	44
Research Institutions and Participants	44
Academic Manager’s Perception of the Term “Academic Capitalism”	45
Three Themes that Impact Academic Managers	48
Theme One: The Rise of Educational Entrepreneurialism	49
Theme Two: Increased Competitiveness	70
Theme Three: Increased Accountability from External Constituencies	79
Status of Higher Education	99
Conclusion	111
CHAPTER V IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	114
Review of Findings.....	114
Implications	120
The Role of Deception.....	135
Implications for Further Research	137
Summary and Conclusion.....	139
REFERENCES	141
APPENDIX A.....	149

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
Table 1 Institutional Student Demographics and Characteristics	48
Table 2 Academic Managers Demographics	49

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, 2011) define academic capitalism and outline the challenges facing higher education. For this study's purposes, academic capitalism was defined as the alignment of the activities of higher education with the needs of the marketplace. Academic capitalism involves institutions, administrators, and faculty engaging in market and market-like behaviors. The literature regarding academic capitalism provides evidence that institutions have increased accountability, engaged in market-like behavior, and operated with reduced public funding. Academic capitalism has had a profound impact on higher education, while the commodification of knowledge is causing a contradiction in academic life (Lincoln, 1998). Although research has revealed that academic capitalism exists within higher education institutions, there is a void in the literature regarding how academic managers cope with, manage, lead and respond to academic capitalism in the twenty-first century. The education, experience, and skills that were once needed to manage a higher education institution have evolved from the origins of academic management to academic capitalism. I sought to explore the evolution and impacts of academic capitalism and how academic managers lead under such regimes.

I proposed to conduct a qualitative study of academic managers leading higher education institutions. The central research agenda will examine interactions between institutional management and academic capitalism. The study will incorporate in-depth interviews and academic managers' observations, including deans, provosts, and presidents at public land grant universities across the southwest United States. I hoped to gain insight from academic managers about the current challenges and realities of managing academic institutions entrenched with

academic capitalism. As a result of this research, I wanted to understand how these academic managers guide their institutions under the increasing pressures of academic capitalism. I discovered the challenges they faced and what skills they successfully, and unsuccessfully, employed. I ultimately wanted to identify the critical skills needed to manage higher education institutions in the twenty-first century. As a practitioner, I hope to gain insight into what skills future academic managers need to succeed.

I established a literary context for this study by outlining the evolution of globalization in the twentieth century and its impact on higher education and how twenty-first-century technologies have contributed to its ascendancy. Next, I examined the influence globalization has had on higher education, with emphasis on Carnegie Tier One institutions. I traced the neo-liberal movement that has helped shift the perception of higher education from a public to a private good. I will further explore how this movement's relationship with the new economy has impacted higher education's operating budget by transforming state and federal funding models. Finally, I linked the literature to academic capitalism and described its impact on faculty work-life to provide a foundation for this study.

The literature review will incorporate terms typically associated with the corporate industry to establish a relatable context for academic capitalism. Therefore, the reader might find unique and interchangeable terms incorporated throughout the study that are yet to be directly associated with academic capitalism.

Progression of Academic Capitalism

It is essential to understand academic capitalism's historical progression and place it within a broader context. Academic capitalism can be traced back to the inception and embracement of globalization. Kauppinen and Cantwell (2014) define globalization as a “set of

processes including cross-border flows of capital, people, and ideas as well as the ascendance of a post-Fordist production model, which has transformed social, political, cultural, and economic relations worldwide” (p. 138). Globalization is happening fast, it’s interconnected, and interrelated and has substantially changed higher education. Despite its pervasiveness, globalization’s impact is experienced unevenly across the academic organizational structure.

As the twenty-first century continues to rely on knowledge production, higher education will inevitably remain central to society’s global economy (Kauppinen & Cantwell, 2014). Within the new global economy, political actors have imposed a greater demand for the United States to excel, challenging higher education to evolve further. According to Valimaa (2014), “funding of students and research depends heavily on public funding sources. The costs of higher education are, in turn, a political issue” (p. 43). Concurrent with globalization, both federal and state governments have demanded greater accountability from higher education institutions. Accountability and policy reform directed explicitly towards higher education result from the costs associated with mass education and rapid expansion (Kallo, 2009). Higher education has received reduced state funding since the 1980s (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997), while institutions have experienced unprecedented enrollment growth. States have demanded greater “accountability” from institutions receiving public funding while local, state, and federal governments have enacted laws that have further commodified knowledge. Society’s initial perspective of higher education, originally viewed as a public good, has shifted more towards a private good.

The new economy is defined as an economy where knowledge is considered raw material produced and commodified for financial resources and capital creation. The commodification of knowledge has evolved in various forms throughout the history of higher

education. The evolution has been impacted by the expansion of research funding and legislation that helped to boost the commodification of knowledge beyond pure scholarly interest. For example, during the 1950s and 1960s, science and engineering research funding was allocated from the Department of Defense (DOD) for weapons and missiles, the Department of Energy for nuclear research, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for cold war superiority (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The most transformative research legislation occurred during the 1980s. The Bayh-Dole Act passed and essentially allowed higher education institutions and researchers to patent intellectual property derived from academic research funded by the federal government (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The Bayh-Dole Act allowed academic actors influenced by external agents in the new globalized economy a great advantage. It also altered the relationship between academic managers and faculty (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Academic managers began to conceptualize faculty research as protected intellectual property with institutional interest that was commodifiable. Faculty, producing research that engaged with the new globalized economy, also began to see their scholarship as a commodifiable product. Slaughter and Rhoades describe it best by concluding, “the act streamlined universities’ participation in the marketplace” (2004, p. 51).

All the while, academic managers adopted corporate techniques including outsourcing college functions, encouraging mass production of education, and increased managerial oversight over every function of the institution (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In addition, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) describe how academic managers embraced non-Fordist manufacturing techniques which align with corporate techniques.

“The new economy does not rely on mass production to the same degree as the industrial economy. Corporate leaders in the new economy have downsized middle management and developed new manufacturing processes that heavily utilize computers (CAD/CAM) and feature just-in-time or contingent workers who

labor for relatively short periods of time and then disperse: the flexible work force” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 18).

The adoption of corporate techniques has resulted in the number of part-time contingent faculty increasing from twenty-two percent in the 1970s to fifty percent in the mid-nineties (Benjamin, 2002).

The mass education revolution occurred between the 1960s and 1970s and was established to promote Western political goals to expand education and research to compete internationally (Valimaa, 2014). Part of the expansion of higher education included introducing new professional associates incorporated within the organizational structure (Valimaa, 2014). “The most radical changes to universities during the 1960s focused on reforming the old administrative and management structures and processes to open university senates to academics other than university professors” (Valimaa, 2014, p.43). Higher education has shifted and is now heavily reliant upon mid-and upper-level management in which their sole function is to audit, manage, and quantify the work of faculty and staff. The adoption of such corporate techniques, the rise of contingent faculty, increased competition, and increased technology have altered the way higher education functions altogether.

External influences have transformed higher education and the greatest impact has been on research funding. Higher education was once known and appreciated as a knowledge-sharing establishment and has since shifted to individual-focused, academic capitalist, knowledge-selling institutions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Within this new framework, institutions have engaged more in market-like behavior to compete for students, faculty, and resources. “Actors within colleges and universities participate in creating new knowledge learning regimes by networking and partnering with an array of external actors” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2011). Slaughter and Rhoades (2011) describe how faculty and administrators have discovered that research

partnerships with external agencies can bolster grant funds, all possibly compromising their institution's research agenda and the original foundation of higher education as a knowledge-sharing establishment.

In today's globalized environment, external funding agencies such as the federal government, external foundations, and corporate agencies influence the institutional research agenda by providing faculty research funding. Along with external partners, national initiatives have cultivated an environment promoting institutions to engage students as consumers and establishing patent property policies and copyright policies. Academic actors within higher education have "worked to intersect opportunities created by the new economy" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2011). Federal research dollars have created a disproportionately funded environment allowing STEM research agendas to prosper while the social sciences and humanities struggle to survive. In many instances, social sciences and humanities departments cannot benefit from external research funding as their 'product' (research) is less patentable or commodifiable as determined by industry.

The impacts of globalization and the new global economy have created an environment with intensified arguments about education as a public versus private good. The effects of commodifying education have redefined research funding models and required institutions to adapt to an ever-changing marketplace. Higher education has continued to adapt to sustain itself within a globalized and competitive society. Institutions have adopted industry practices and corporate techniques while engaging with external funding agencies to secure external funding. There is substantial literature regarding the evolution and the effects of academic capitalism on higher education and its implications for the professoriate. There is limited literature about academic managers and how they contribute to the new economy; however, there is no literature

regarding the impact of academic capitalism on higher education leadership (academic managers) detailing what skill sets are needed to manage today's institutions. I hope to provide research regarding why and how academic managers – specifically presidents, provosts, and deans – engage in and with academic capitalism and identify what skillsets future academic managers need.

Problem Statement

There is substantial scholarly evidence that academic capitalism in the neo-liberal state is operative in higher education. There is some notion of the implications of academic capitalism on academic managers in higher education, including increased accountability, reduced state funding, and academic managers' engagement in market-like behaviors. The literature also provides direct evidence that academic capitalism has profoundly altered the work-life of college professors. Faculty today feel pressured to incorporate technology into their courses, have a reduced sense of space and time, understand the effects of the commodification of knowledge, and resent the imposition of an insidious audit culture to maximize production.

The research literature provides no insight on what academic managers think about neo-liberalism and academic capitalism or how they lead higher education institutions within that environment. How are academic managers responding to academic capitalism? How do academic managers feel about higher education's transformation? What do academic managers believe is an appropriate response to academic capitalism?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to explore academic managers' perceptions of academic capitalism at public land grant research-intensive institutions in the southwest United States. It is essential to understand the approaches, trends, constructions, and institutional cultures to gauge

academic managers' perceptions of academic capitalism and neo-liberalism in the twenty-first century.

This study considers the following assumptions:

- There are differences between public and private institutions.
- There are differences between research-intensive institutions and other types of institutions.
- Participants will have a basic understanding of academic capitalism.
- Participants will be able to identify and articulate present and future implications for their institutions.
- The context of this qualitative study influences the ultimate findings.
- Findings will apply to institutions in a similar geographical location and institutional status.
- As with many qualitative studies, the initial inquiry may evolve throughout the study.

Research Questions

Below are the initial six research questions that guided this study:

1. Do academic managers know and understand the new economy and academic capitalism?
2. What do academic managers think about neo-liberalism and academic capitalism?
3. What do academic managers think is an appropriate response to academic capitalism, if any?
4. Do academic managers feel comfortable leading higher education institutions embedded with academic capitalism? What benefits and challenges do academic managers see in academic capitalism?

5. Where do academic managers see the future of academic capitalism and its effects on higher education? What skills do current academic managers believe future academic managers will need to lead institutions?
6. Do academic managers weigh academic capitalism against their values? If so, how do the two value systems compare against each other?

Significance of the Study

Higher education has evolved throughout its history. Perhaps the most significant changes have occurred within the last twenty-five years. External influences have intruded into higher education policy, funding, and culture. Many academic managers have formal education with advanced degrees and a variety of leadership experiences. As higher education has evolved, more individuals with external backgrounds are leading institutions. Academic managers now have diverse credentials with expertise in academics, external industry, and the public sector.

Academic capitalism will continue to become more complex as institutional and external boundaries become more fluid. It is significant for higher education to understand how academic managers are dealing with fluid boundaries among external partners. Current academic managers who participate in this study will relate firsthand experiences while leading higher education institutions entrenched with academic capitalism. Research addresses identifying academic capitalism as a concept and the implications on faculty. Still, there is no research regarding the impact of academic capitalism on academic managers. Future academic managers will benefit from having this research detailing the skill sets and approaches that current academic managers have utilized to provide a new approach to higher education leadership. The results of this study will also provide information to university boards of regents and faculty about the current status of academic management.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Globalization

The concept of a globalized economic environment evolved after the oil crisis of 1973 (Teune, 2002). Slaughter and Leslie (1997, pg.17) define globalization as a situation where “the business or corporate sector in industrialized countries pushed the state to devote more resources to the enhancement and management of innovation so that corporations and the nations in which they were headquartered could compete more successfully in world markets.” Globalization began to move from concept to practice in an effort to create integrated economies that were never before seen (Irwin, 2001). Communist countries like China and the former Soviet Union began to embrace “the encapsulation of the world into a single economic system” (Teune, 2002). In the west, acknowledging this new world order, the United States publicly joined the globalization movement. In 1994 President Bill Clinton declared that America’s economic policies would promote the country to compete and win in this new global economy (Public Papers of the President of the United States, 1994, p206-214 [remarks at American University]). Although this was the government’s first public acknowledgment of globalization becoming a feature of America’s economy, the process emerged long before President Clinton’s speech in 1994. The concept of competing within an integrated economy resonated with the majority of Americans as it sounded exciting and appealing to the United States during the mid-nineties.

As the new economic markets began to coalesce, Pacific Rim countries began to increase their economic participation, which created a situation for multinational corporations to emerge and dominate (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Pacific Rim multinational corporations found themselves at an advantage by providing cheaper labor costs and higher production rates.

Industrialized countries could not compete with developing countries in the new global market environment. Large multinational companies within industrialized countries had to reconsider how they would compete in the modern globalized economy. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) suggested that these multinational corporations had to incorporate technology to remain competitive.

Much of the new globalized economy's research and development would fall to major universities as historically they have been the catalyst for innovation. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) revealed that the multinational companies turned directly to higher education for the creation of “science-based products and processes” (p. 28). The union of multinational corporations and higher education became the center of American innovation. Drastic impacts for both parties would emerge.

One of the societal ramifications of globalization suggested by Anthony Gibbens (1990) is “a compression of space and time.” Also, Alexander (2005, pg. 117) added:

Compression affects not only the pragmatics but the semantics of communication, the basic meaning units, the symbolic languages upon which interactions depend. There exist not only new technologies of movement and communication but more condensed and transcendent cultural logics, such as feeling more widely than before. It is by the compression of space, time, and meaning that globalization creates a significantly more expansive field of action and organization.

Globalization has led to the creation of new technologies aligned with the concept of compressed space and time. Altbach, Reisberg, and Rumbley (2010) identified several realities of globalization within the twenty-first century, including new information and communications technology development and the emergence of an international knowledge network.

Globalization impacted higher education through internationalization, massification, competition, reduced government funding, and faculty entrepreneurship. Most of these

ramifications are attributed to globalization and have been harmful for higher education, considering that higher education institutional missions were designed for the “public good.” The controversy surrounding the impact of globalization on higher education centers on the debate between the public good mission versus entrepreneurial capitalism, which forces institutions to incorporate market-like, competitive behaviors and, to some extent, ignores the non-remunerative “public good.”

Neoliberal State

Neoliberalism is an ideology with competition as the defining characteristic of human relations. “Neoliberalism does not merely privatize – turn over to the market for individual production and consumption – what was formerly publicly supported and valued. Rather, it formulates everything, everywhere, in terms of capital investment and appreciation, including and especially humans themselves” (p. 176). Neoliberalism defines citizens as consumers and maintains that “the market” delivers societal benefits.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) describe the neoliberal state as one that “focuses not on social welfare for the citizenry as a whole but on enabling individuals as economic actors (p.20).” In general terms, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) described neo-liberalism as the government moving resources from social welfare to a production function focus. The authors explain that the neo-liberal state government enacted laws that helped to create a new economy. Perhaps the most impactful law passed, which has transformed higher education, was the 1980 Bayh-Dole Act. Jennifer Washburn (2005) detailed that the act was intended “to reverse the United States’ precipitous economic decline during the 1970s” (p. 60). The two senators who sponsored the bill argued that “federal patent reform was necessary to jump-start U.S. industrial

competitiveness when the nation was facing a growing trade deficit with Japan” (Washburn, 2005, p. 60).

Another government regulation that helped create the new economy was the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965. In 1964 President Lyndon B. Johnson outlined his Great Society domestic agenda. This plan attempted to reduce racial inequalities and the country’s poverty level within the United States (Dollinger, 2001). Part of Johnson’s Great Society legislation addressed postsecondary education. The Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 included five titles: I) creation of continuing education and community services programs; II) college library assistance and library training and research; III) strengthening developing institutions; IV) student assistance (financial aid); and V) improving the quality of teacher education (Davis, Green-Derry, & Jones, 2012). Title IV addressed national poverty and inequalities within higher education. Johnson’s legislation sought to increase the amount of low- and middle-income students who entered higher education (Dollinger, 2001). The act included three forms of student assistance.

The act created educational opportunity grants for students in financial need. It established guaranteed private loans for low-income students, expanded the Perkins Loan Program, and formulated the work-study program (Davis et al., 2012). There is no sign of reducing government involvement as the HEA has been reauthorized ten times since 1965. “While the federal government does provide the lion’s share of direct student aid, it still supplies only 15 percent of college and university revenues” (Mumper, Gladieux, King, & Corrigan, 2011, p.134). Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) attributed the government’s expansion of the student loan programs in 1976 as a contributing factor in empowering students to become consumers and requiring institutions to engage in market-like behavior. The change in the

distribution of financial aid directly to the students created a situation where students became mobile. It expanded student choice and expanded the geographical parameters where students would consider going to college.

In 1994, President Bill Clinton convinced Congress to enact the Taxpayer Relief Act that contained tax breaks for families with students in college (Mumper et al., 2011). In addition, the Hope and Lifelong Learning tax credits were enacted to assist middle-income families. These federal tax credits and breaks are another example of how the federal government shifted higher education from a social welfare concept to enabling individuals, predominantly middle-class families, to engage as economic actors.

While higher education dealt with reduced state funding, the impact of globalization on the United States culture caused a dramatic shift to increased accountability. Higher education would soon feel the cultural shift's direct results from an input-based model of assessment to an outcome-based evaluation (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004). Since the mid-1980s, higher education has consistently received reduced state appropriations (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Nationally, higher education has experienced a shift in funding from being state-funded to state-supported. "The declining percentage of state funding for public institutions is the result, to a large extent, of the escalating costs of the federal Medicaid program" (McGinness, 2011, p. 144). This reduced funding came when higher education has experienced remarkable enrollment growth, inflation of costs associated with the operation, and increased accountability demands from neo-liberal state legislators. The shift in funding sources has caused higher education to review faculty composition, the faculty-student relationship, and the curriculum and governance structures, to create a culture of accountability (Lincoln, 2012; Strathern, 2000). Lincoln (2012)

described the funding sources for higher education, shifting as the United States' political economy has moved from a national to a global perspective.

Academic Capitalism

Higher education finds itself in a neo-liberal economic period that requires institutions and academic managers to engage in academic capitalism. Slaughter & Leslie's (1997) definition of academic capitalism most closely aligns with this study's scope, as this study will research higher education leadership in a political economy. This research project defines academic capitalism as "institutional and professorial market or market-like efforts to secure external moneys" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 8). Higher education has been transforming since the 1980s. Although there are differing ideas regarding when academic capitalism emerged, there is a general agreement among higher education researchers that academic capitalism has several implications on higher education. Although there are multiple implications of academic capitalism, there are two major themes that surfaced from literature. Higher education institutions continue to seek outside resources to offset the continued reduction of state funding. The lack of funding resources has altered faculty composition at institutions and their participation in shared governance.

The literature provides substantial evidence that academic capitalism has impacted the operation and funding models that previously existed. Higher education has continued to respond to increased demands for accountability from public and governmental stakeholders (Giri, 2000; Strathern, 2000), all while "increasing departmental focus on moving curriculum and instruction to new markets, primarily in pursuit of revenue" (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004, p. 39). In pursuing new revenue sources, higher education has incorporated entrepreneurial and market-like initiatives. Institutional priorities include credit-hour production over educational quality,

offering additional summer courses for revenue, relying on more adjunct and graduate students to teach classes, offering faster-paced professional graduate degrees, increasing online classes and degree offerings, increasing ownership and royalties of intellectual products produced by faculty and staff, and consistently raising tuition and fees to offset budget shortfalls (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004).

Slaughter & Leslie (1997) concluded that reducing public funds allocated to institutions impacted higher education's new economy. Institutions operating in the new political economy must strive to establish revenue-generating streams to sustain the impact of reduced public funds. Institutions have sought other direct revenue sources by partnering with external groups, associations, and agencies (Harclerod & Eaton, 2011). Harclerod and Eaton (2011) identified external groups as community foundations, family or personal foundations, special purpose foundations, company foundations, and independent national foundations. These external-funding agencies “can affect postsecondary institutions through their choice of area to support. Institutional change continues to be a prime goal of foundations, as it has been for most of the past century” (Harclerod & Eaton, 2011, p. 198).

Perhaps one of the most significant consequences of academic capitalism has been on the composition of the professoriate. The current political economy's fiscal constraints require institutions to shift their faculty composition to include a majority of part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions (Altbach, 2011). Within the last thirty to forty years, higher education faculty composition has experienced a dramatic shift (Ehrenberg, 2012). A national trend has emerged in a review of data collected from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, also known as IPEDS. More institutions are hiring full-time non-tenured track faculty than data collected in 1995 (Ehrenberg, 2012). Nationally, full-time faculty numbers have

dropped from eighty percent in 1970 to fifty-one percent in 2007 (Snyder & Dillow, 2010). The increase in part-time and non-tenure-track faculty during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has provided faculty challenges. Most part-time and non-tenure-track faculty members are at a disadvantage compared to their full-time tenured faculty counterparts. By design, part-time faculty members do not have long-term commitments from the institutions they serve. Because of this, most part-time faculty members' workloads are extensive and include teaching assignments at multiple institutions (Ehrenberg, 2012). This burden hinders the part-time faculty's ability to sustain a presence outside of the classroom, which ultimately impacts the faculty's ability to interact with students, affecting student learning (Ehrenberg, 2012). All of these factors result in fewer positions available for academic scholars and less commitment from institutions, which has fostered a culture where shared governance is a concept but not always practiced.

The new economy has allowed academic capitalism to function within higher education over the last two decades. Reduced funding from state governments has created an environment where higher education is continually pursuing revenue from outside entities. The need for these external monies perpetrates market-like behavior among faculty and academic managers. There is substantial evidence that academic capitalism is transforming – and indeed, has already transformed – higher education. The transformation also impacts faculty directly beyond the composition and shared governance aspect. The literature overwhelmingly supports that faculty work-life has also been transformed.

Faculty Work-Life

The impacts of academic capitalism and the neo-liberal political climate have redefined the educational work environment for higher education faculty. Research provides a substantial

amount of evidence to support that the faculty experience has evolved. Faculty have acknowledged and identified how academic capitalism has infringed upon their work lives. The recurring themes that emerged from the literature include the impact of new and incorporated technology, the compression of space and time, the devaluation of research as a public good, institutions participating in market-like behaviors, the emergence of an intrusive audit culture within the academy, and the evolution of the tenure review process. Although these themes individually may have a small impact, together they redefined the work-life of faculty. Three factors have really influenced and transformed faculty work-life. Technology, time, and the inclusion of non-profit corporate management techniques all have engaged in creating a hyper-professional environment where faculty are uncomfortable and required to justify and quantify every minute of their day.

Technology has had the greatest impact on redefining the faculty work-life and it increases expectations to the environment in which it is incorporated (Kirkwood & Price, 2013). Technology has provided benefits for the classroom as it delivered a platform for student learning in a virtual world. Now, more than ever, virtual learning is almost a necessity in a COVID-era. Technology has expanded communication options for faculty and students alike. Faculty expectations have evolved along with technological innovation. Gonzales, Martinez, & Ordu (2013) conducted a study of faculty experiences at a striving university engaged in academic capitalism and found that technology directly impacted faculty work. The researchers concluded that “on one hand, the professor's ability to continue to teach through technology was helpful. On the other hand, as the professor noted, her classes were larger, which made virtual teaching a less than optimal experience” (Gonzales, Martinez, & Ordu, 2013, p. 1106).

Universities urged faculty to learn new teaching platforms and methodologies in addition to teaching more students online. Requiring faculty to incorporate modern technologies to include online classes intruded into their personal lives as student expectations have grown to surpass the virtual classroom and expectations include instant and constant contact with faculty. Faculty noted that they had to spend many more hours during the evenings and weekends, replying to emails and responding to scholarly discussions at home. Thus, “technology broke down boundaries between home life and work life” (Gonzales, Martinez, & Ordu, 2013, p. 1106). Technological advances in academia have posed a double-edged sword for faculty. While it provides students, faculty, and academic managers with obvious advantages it encroaches upon the delineation between work and life boundaries.

Higher education institutions are also expanding virtual learning and distance education through technology (Austin, 2002). Student demand for distance education has required faculty to incorporate new pedagogies and methodologies to deliver course content via the Internet. Professors must allocate time to learn new instructional software while maintaining their current workload (advising, institutional commitments, and researching). Austin (2002), in discussing the preparation of graduate students for an academic career, concluded that as “more academic institutions and their competitors incorporate virtual education into degree programs, faculty members will be expected to use technology-mediated teaching and learning strategies, as well as provide distance-learning opportunities” (p. 98). With the global pandemic, academia was forced to shift to online learning which required faculty to reinvent their teaching techniques and adjust to new platforms. Online teaching and the incorporation of new learning technologies not only have impacted the course delivery process, but it has compressed the time and space between academic work life and home.

Another prominent factor that emerged from the literature was the pressure of time and space within academia. Faculty cited negative experiences with time pressures and the reduction of space granted to them by their administrators or institutions. Walker (2009) identified three typical pressures created through academic capitalism: “no time, efficient use of time, and moral imperative use of time” (p.498). Regarding ‘no time’, Walker (2009) explained that university work knows no time-boundaries, as everything in academia is time-sensitive. Faculty are expected to serve on institutional committees while maintaining a reputable research record, serving the public, teaching, being an intellect, acquiring grants, and producing publications and patents (Walker, 2009). The institutional requirements of being a faculty member reduce the time for reading, engagement with students, time to reflect, and the creativity to conduct research (Walker, 2009).

Walker (2009) detailed that university leaders expect faculty to *use time and apply business logic to academia efficiently*. “For the academic, there is an overt tension: between being a flexible, autonomous worker and being increasingly more regulated by time and by demands of accountability” (Walker, 2009, p. 499). Institutions and individuals are encouraged to incorporate business-like strategies such as cost-benefit analysis with programs and learning (Walker, 2009).

As for the *moral imperative of time use*, Walker (2009) explained that “the morality of modernity, old capitalism, and liberalism has thus continued into new global capitalism and neo-liberalism and has become intensified in the process. With greater tools for productivity come greater expectations. In the academy we must continually justify our use of time to ourselves and others” (Walker, p. 499). Walker (2009) asserted that time equates to merit within academics and demonstrates competence by producing the most in the least amount of time. Nasseh (1999)

conducted a study over the effects of the twenty-first century in higher education and reported, “over 70 percent of instructors indicated that they answer students' questions in the evenings and on weekends” (p. 4). Faculty members are compensating for the shift that technology has created and meeting greater expectations by blurring the lines of their personal and professional lives.

The twenty-first-century market-driven college student believes that communication is instantaneous. Faculty have resolved to work from home and compulsively work by incorporating new technological devices that can prove helpful but intrusive (Gornall & Salisbury, 2012). With the adoption of technology, faculty have resorted to always being available, and the expectation is that they will respond quickly and accurately. Gornall and Salisbury (2012) observed that more faculty members are using mobile devices to communicate and resolve matters to stay ahead of their work. The result of faculty expanding their communication with mobile devices has “generalized the environment in which work can occupy almost any space, public or private” (Gornall & Salisbury, 2012, p. 142). Gonzales et al. (2013) described how faculty explained that “work can (and often is expected to) be carried out while away from one's official workspaces” (p. 1102). Faculty agree that “time and space have taken on a more fluid character and all agree that time pressure is one of the key ways that neoliberalism manifests in the lives of academics” (Gonzales et al., 2013, p. 1102). Indeed, academic capitalism has impacted faculty experiences. Menzies and Newson (2007) summed it up best, noting that “the university is no longer a refuge from the hustle-bustle, a slow zone for reading and reflection, critical dialogue and knowledge creation - to the extent that it ever was” (p. 83).

Gornall and Salisbury (2012) published an article titled *Compulsive working, 'Hyperprofessionalism' and the Unseen Pleasures of Academic Work*. This article provided in-

depth interviews with faculty members regarding their work lives. The faculty participating in the study consistently cited that they were working extensive outside hours to meet the demand of their new environments. One faculty member stated:

I'm in work at 8am and leave around 6pm. Once home, I'll usually work until about 8:30 or 9:00pm clearing my email, marking, reading/research Next morning, [on campus] in the 8:00-9:00am slot, I look at e-mail left on screen and use my inbox as an aide memoire - might send myself an email the night before with notes for the day - make phone calls. So this is every day and every evening. I try to keep Saturday free as a day for myself, but Sunday I'll work from home more of the day (Gornall & Salisbury, 2012, p. 138).

Another participant stated that:

I work 9-5 in the office everyday. In a typical week, I do work for my research two nights a week, so [these] are my research project [evenings]. The other evenings I would probably do two-to three hours [per night] at home, and I would probably also do four or five hours on a Sunday (Gornall & Salisbury, 2012, p. 138).

Gornall and Salisbury (2012) coined the term 'hyper professionalism' describing it as the "aim to capture the alignment between the professional, the always-connected modality of a continuous electronic environment and research with academics in their important but unseen work" (p. 150). This example illustrates how time impacts faculty work-life all while expectations of faculty continue to grow.

The emphasis on maximizing academic production and time has blurred distinctions between personal and professional environments. Menzies and Newson (2007) conducted a survey of faculty in a global university setting, and sixty-nine percent of those surveyed responded that they "do not thrive" under time pressures (p. 87). Also, respondents cited that they dealt with stress symptoms: sleep deprivation, new allergies or food sensitivities, short-term memory loss, and problems concentrating (Menzies & Newson, 2007, p. 87). Faculty now feel as if they are always behind, always searching for concealed time, and ever feeling a sense of guilt

for not completing their work (Ylijoki, 2013; Gornall & Salisbury, 2012; Nasseh, 1999). As a result, they feel a heightened sense of anxiety, affecting their overall health (Ylijoki, 2013).

Ylijoki (2013) studied boundary work within a high-speed university. A technology professor stated, “the only threat is that for some reason I won’t be able to keep up with the field, but then again, it’s entirely up to me” (p. 246).

In addition to technology and the increased pressure of time, faculty work-life has also been impacted by the implementation of corporate management techniques to ensure greater accountability. Academic managers have adapted to a new non-profit corporate management approach while implementing systems to quantify work. This approach to management is occurring all while the environment for higher education has evolved to require institutions to compete for greater prestige. Increasing demand for research requires faculty to solicit prestigious research funding to add to their dossier for tenure review and prestige. There is strong evidence that higher education has shifted from a public good toward a knowledge production industry expected to engage with external agencies (Gonzales et al., 2013). Under academic capitalism, institutions are required to engage with outside industries and secure research dollars from the Federal government. These external research partnerships create a marketplace for research, where Lincoln (1998) explained that “we have a classic economic 'market' configuration, characterized by a 'buyer' (the Federal government) and a 'seller' (faculty skills and IHE desire for flexible funding), both eager for each other's wares” (p. 267).

For neo-liberals, these research partnerships provide alternate funding and seem to have positive implications for higher education. Lincoln (1998) describes the acceptance of external monies for research designed by outside agencies as a “market model which acts to treat knowledge, whether basic or applied, as a consumer commodity” (p. 268). The reality is that

most faculty who can produce knowledge for commodities primarily fall within science, technology, engineering, and business fields. Lincoln (1998) describes several effects of the commodification of experience as well as the institutional impacts on faculty who are not in science, technology, engineering, and business fields:

For academics to engage in collaborative work with persons who are poor, marginalized, minorities, or otherwise disenfranchised is sometimes to withdraw voluntarily from an extensive reward system created to subsidize both faculty as individuals and institutions, simply because such work is not frequently funded, not often taken account of in the promotion and tenure process, and rarely connected - at least in major research universities - to merit pay systems. (Lincoln, 1998, p. 268).

Marilyn Strathern's book (2000) *Audit Culture* detailed how academics transformed from a culture focused on research and teaching to a new audit culture that incorporated pervasive accountability practices. Strathern (2000) describes, "Throughout the 1980s, the education system – and particularly higher education – was accused of having 'failed the economy.' This criticism was justification for introducing new managerialism methods to increase efficiency and productivity" (p. 67). Menzies & Newson (2007) explained how institutions have implemented performance-based measures for faculty, including completing workload forms. These workload forms allow for academic managers to intrusively audit faculty productivity. The workload forms offend faculty and "can signify its subject as someone who is not working hard enough, or conversely as someone who is prone to overwork and does not adequately manage her time" (Bansel, P., Davies, B., Gannon, S., & Linnell, S., 2008, p. 679). The modern audit culture is partly perpetrated by higher education's governing trustees, who, for the most part, are corporate executives who are responding to shrinking state-allocated funds. Strathern (2000) detailed how modern universities have hired 'quality assurance officers' and 'internal auditors' whose sole purpose is to monitor committees' processes and progress. Strathern (2000) provided evidence of

universities leveraging ‘research surveillance’ in which review boards scrutinize proposed research methodologies and orientations of faculty.

“Audits are needed when accountability can no longer be sustained by informal relations of trust alone but must be formalized, made visible and subject to independent validation” (Power, 1994, p.11). Lincoln (2011) explained that these neo-liberal, managerial mechanisms regulate and normalize faculty. The audit culture within higher education has had a profound impact on faculty work life by diminishing individual creativity within the profession and creating an environment of heightened surveillance. Strathern (2000) suggested that the new audit culture's indications encourage a growing fear among faculty in the following areas: research surveillance, risk assessment, student complaints, fiscal cuts, and tenure. Strathern (2000) stated that “there is the trepidation of department chairs or individual faculty members when a complaint is made to the ombud’s office, even when this is a strictly advisory role without powers of sanction or even much evidence of political influence” (p. 229).

Academic managers have introduced additional administrative techniques to measure faculty work and assimilate it into the neo-liberal culture. These mechanisms require time to document, create written reports, and learn new software systems. The new managerial regime requires faculty to participate in evaluations, submit self-reports, develop mission statements, and revise strategic plans (Ylijoki, 2013). State legislators have also begun to introduce legislation that will hold faculty more “accountable.” Texas passed a bill requiring faculty to submit their syllabi online to hold them accountable for course lectures. “Faculty have criticized the bill, claiming ‘legislative micromanagement’ and ‘another step toward the consumerization’ of teaching and learning” (Lincoln, 2011, p. 370). Whether intentionally or not, lawmakers and

institutions implementing market-like behaviors have exacerbated an audit culture in higher education.

The impacts of reducing tenure-eligible positions and regulating the tenure review process have severe bearings on faculty's academic freedom. Removing academic freedom from the core of a university function creates a perfect 'corporatized university' (Amit, 2000; Shore & Wright, 2000). A 'corporatized university' creates an environment without shared governance and accountability only of the governing authority. Academic capitalism has also fashioned a new approach to the tenure review process. Many institutions are reducing the amount of tenure-eligible positions (Selingo, 1998) and inserting more board authority over the approval process. For instance, Lincoln (2011) identifies this practice as having several impacts on faculty work-life:

The Board of Regents at this same institution just announced that promotion and tenure dossiers will come off the "consent agenda." For many decades, Boards have placed promotion and tenure decisions on the consent agenda, leaving the professional and disciplinary decisions to professional academics - those who are closest to the core functions of teaching, research, and service. This move is clearly read by faculty as a threat to the tenure and promotion process, and given the Board's publicly expressed dissatisfaction with a tenure system, and the former Chairman of the Board's public dismissal of the principle of shared governance, as a threat to tenure itself at this institution. (Lincoln, 2011, p. 370).

In addition to reducing tenured faculty positions, the tenure review process has also evolved throughout its history. Scholarly literature and teaching were once heavily weighed by administrators and colleagues when reviewing faculty's tenure credentials. Increased market-like activity and institutional desire for national recognition have facilitated creating a new environment where outside funding and commodification can sometimes weigh more heavily than scholarship in the tenure review process. Alongside external financing, the reduction of time within higher education has also limited faculty's ability to thoroughly and meticulously evaluate

their peers' work, often facilitating faculty to vote without a comprehensive review of the body of work produced. The reduction of tenured positions combined with the evolving tenure review process certainly has altered the composition of effective faculty and the shared governance of an institution.

There is substantial evidence that outlines the implications of academic capitalism on the professoriate and the academy. The literature cited above substantiates that faculty work-life has been altered. Technology, time pressure, and non-profit corporate management techniques have not only redefined work for faculty, but it has also created an environment where the work is intrusively present inside and outside of the office. Not only is the work more invasive, but the non-profit corporate techniques institutionalized by academic managers also require faculty to regulate and quantify their work in an attempt to justify production and exploit opportunities for additional work.

There is a gap in the research regarding the role of academic managers in the academic capitalist environment. My intent is to interview and observe academic managers to help understand what their role is in creating the new environment and if they are aware of the evolution. I hope to provide a better understanding of how we ended up here and get a sense from academic managers on if there is anything that we can do about this new direction. Is there a breaking point for faculty, higher education, or academic managers? Do academic managers understand what's happening and how their role intersects with faculty, external partners, legislatures, and society? Are academic managers satisfied with their role and what do they see as the future for higher education? Although I may not be able to answer all of the above questions at the conclusion of this study, I believe the conclusions will provide insight into how

academic managers operate under the academic capitalist environment which will be the first revelation in an attempt to better understand where higher education stands today.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research study will be a naturalist inquiry strategy. The focus of this inquiry examined the perceptions and observations of academic managers leading public Land Grant institutions while operating under academic capitalism in the twenty-first century and the future skills leaders will need in order to be successful. There will be multiple realities constructed by each academic manager who participates in the study. I intended to interview academic managers to build our joint reality of how they lead institutions operating under academic capitalism in the twenty-first century. After an extensive review of the literature, I compiled several potential questions for academic managers:

- How do managers define academic capitalism?
- How do academic managers believe that universities are responsible for research and development in the new globalized economy?
- What are the impacts of globalization on higher education?
- How do academic managers compete for prestige?
- How do academic managers deal with reduced funding from state and federal agencies?
- How does the inclusion of entrepreneurial activity in higher education impact the institution?
- What do academic managers believe regarding the debate of education as a public versus private good?
- To what do they attribute an increase in accountability within higher education?
- How has the incorporation of market-like activities impacted higher education?

- How do academic managers feel about higher education faculty composition, including more part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty positions?
- The neo-liberal state has enacted laws that have created a new economy. How has the new economy impacted higher education?
- Since faculty work-life changed because of academic capitalism, how do academic managers work with their faculty? Do academic managers believe that there is a compression of space and time within academia?
- What do academic managers think about the shift of research from the public good to the modern commodification of research?
- What do academic managers think about the heightened audit culture within higher education, and how do they manage their faculty/environments?
- What do academic managers think of the evolving tenure review process?

Other research questions arose as this is an emergent design. The participants suggested additional follow questions. It was vital for me to gather extensive and intimate information on how and why these academic managers engage in academic capitalism. As a result of this study, I better understood the benefits and challenges associated with academic managers who engaged in academic capitalism. I also explored academic managers' values to better understand their behavior, especially to see whether their own personal values aligned with neoliberal values or how they may differ. The research conducted in this study provides potential skillsets for future academic managers. As the researcher, I considered multiple paradigms to utilize in this study and concluded that the naturalist paradigm was the paradigm of choice.

Five Axioms of the Naturalist Paradigm

Lincoln and Guba (1985) presented five axioms included within the naturalist paradigm for the researcher's consideration. I will address each of the axioms with this study. The first axiom addresses the nature of reality. Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 37) stated that "there are multiple realities that can be studied only holistically." Higher education management is complex, and with the additional component of academic capitalism, considering each manager's multiple realities will inform a holistic understanding of this study. Each participant in this study will have varied individual experiences, professional development, and social realities. Some participants may have ample experience within higher education, while others may be newer to the environment. Academic capitalism provides challenges and limited benefits to various actors within higher education and could have multiple impacts on academic managers. As the researcher, I will examine each of the individual realities holistically to interpret my findings.

The second axiom presents claims that "the inquirer and the 'object' of inquiry interact to influence one another" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 37), an axiom which obviates the possibility of objectivity. Within this study, the researcher and object of inquiry will have interactions that will influence one another. As a consequence, the reality reported on is co-created, prompted by the exchange. As I solicited participation in this study, respondents knew I was interested in exploring academic leadership in a period of academic capitalism. The participant's willingness to participate in the survey influenced me as I assumed that they were interested in expressing their perceptions of academic management and capitalism. This two-way interaction created a dual influence upon the researcher and participant and also on the study.

The third axiom within the naturalist paradigm is that the "aim of the inquiry is to develop an idiographic body of knowledge in the form of 'working hypotheses' that describe the

individual case” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 38). I placed this study within the context of the twenty-first century and public research-intensive institutions. Although I provided evidence that may be generalizable, it is evident that readers cannot translate this study as the reality for all academic managers, institutions, or environments. Clearly, generalization may also be problematic.

The fourth axiom states that “all entities are in a state of mutual simultaneous shaping so that it is impossible to distinguish causes from effects” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 38). Within the naturalistic paradigm, Lincoln and Guba (1985) replaced the concept of causality with mutual shaping. Lincoln and Guba (1985) provided evidence that mutual shaping is “more in tune with emergent epistemological and paradigmatic considerations,” particularly in the hard sciences. This inquiry was emergent and it examined natural variation and only included a general-purpose, approach, and limited boundaries. Considering that academic capitalism is not a result of linear causality but is mutually shaping several political, societal, and evolving environmental factors, it seemed most appropriate to conduct this study within the naturalist paradigm.

The final axiom described by Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 38), claimed that “inquiry is value-bound.” The values inherent to the inquirer and respondents, the paradigm selected, substantive theory, and context influenced this study. The participant’s values will also affect the analysis and the context of higher education, academic capitalism, and the twenty-first century. This study was value-bounded in various contexts that produced multiple constructions that have value, although they may not be absolute. I believed the problem, paradigm, theory, and context are congruent, which allowed for the research to produce meaningful results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Research Design

The sample population for this study was academic managers at public Land Grant institutions. The Center for Postsecondary Research at the Indiana University School of Education maintains the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education is a framework implemented in 1973 to promote research and policy analysis. The Carnegie Classification framework has been modified several times since its inception and classifies institutions into five categories (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). The five types are doctoral-granting institutions, comprehensive colleges, liberal arts colleges, two-year colleges and institutions, and professional schools (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). This study examined doctoral-granting institutions.

Sites, Participants, and Sampling

Land-grant institutions in the southwest United States were the primary site locations considered within this study. Texas A&M University, New Mexico State University, Oklahoma State University, University of Arkansas, and Louisiana State University were the initial institutions considered for this study. Institutions with the land-grant designation have distinctive missions from non-land grant institutions. “The establishment of a land-grant university was an independent act by the US federal government that endowed specific states across the country with a university” (Mack & Stolarick, 2014, p. 384). Land-grant universities’ missions were formerly primarily dedicated to agricultural and mechanical arts (Mack & Stolarick, 2014). These five universities reflect the growing Hispanic enrollment projected to mirror the student demographics attending universities throughout the United States in the future. “Each year, approximately one million immigrants enter the United States (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration

Services, 2004). The majority of them reside in California, New York, and Texas and are afforded the opportunity to enroll in postsecondary institutions” (Lester, 2006, p.49).

Research studies have concluded that universities can have an economic impact when institutions exist in a financial area that can attract and commercialize research and innovation (Arbo & Benneworth, 2007; Armstrong, 2001; Florida, Knudsen, & Stolarick, 2010). Land-grant institutions are unique in that their establishment was government-mandated (Mack & Stolarick, 2014). Because the federal government initiated land-grant institutions, it is compelling to research the effects reduced state funding and increased government accountability have on the modern-day university.

Participants within this study were academic managers engaged in managing departments, programs, budgets, and faculty. Academic managers consisted of university presidents, provosts, and deans. I intended to interview academic managers who represent diverse demographics, backgrounds, ethnicities, and are equal in the number of participants regarding gender, if possible. I sought participants via a solicitation letter sent to all qualified participants.

I utilized purposive sampling to identify the academic managers solicited to participate in the survey. “Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 2009, p. 77). Utilizing purposeful sampling also allowed the investigator to devise grounded theory by taking considerations of “local conditions, local mutual shaping, and local values” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 40). The sampling mode of choice for this study was maximum variation sampling to examine the widest variety of perspectives. I

also sought assistance from initial participants as to additional academic managers who should be included in the study, thus utilizing the snowball effect to ensure maximum variation.

Instrumentation

I was the primary data-gathering instrument following the naturalist paradigm. “Charmaz advocates for a social constructivist perspective that includes emphasizing diverse local worlds, multiple realities, and the complexities of particular worlds, views, and actions” (Creswell, 2007, p. 65). I begin this research project as the learner in equivalence with academic managers interviewed during the study. The project's research design was emergent and a context-dependent inquiry utilizing inductive data analysis. The participants had various realities, and I examined their socially constructed realities, interactions, values, and beliefs to guide the study.

Data Collection

Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that a naturalist inquiry's findings will be more ‘credible’ if the inquirer can demonstrate a prolonged period of engagement, provide evidence of persistent observation, and create the ability to triangulate. As the primary data collection tool, I used a documentary analysis to maximize the study’s triangulation to validate the study's findings, including policies, procedures, etc. Data came from interviews with participants, observation of participants before, during, and after the interview sessions; and document analysis. Concerning trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Hays and Singh (2012) established objectives for qualitative research design. Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are the areas the researcher should focus on to build trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Hays & Singh, 2012). In 1994, Lincoln and Guba added authenticity to five areas within qualitative inquiry a researcher should consider to establish trustworthiness.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) express that credibility must come from the source respondents through means of the researcher seeking verification of their reconstructed data. Merriam (1991) also encouraged prolonged engagement and persistent observation to build trust with the study participants. “Credibility is one of the major criteria qualitative researchers used to determine if conclusions make sense for a qualitative study” (Hays & Singh, 2012, p. 200). Merriam (2009) stated that “in qualitative research, a single case or small, nonrandom, purposeful sample is selected precisely because the researcher wishes to understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many” (p. 224). Transferability, Hays, and Singh (2012) explained, means that the researcher should provide detailed information regarding the research process, participants, setting, and time frame to allow the readers to decipher the findings' applicability to individuals and their environments. Lincoln and Guba (1985) also suggested for the researcher to “accumulate empirical evidence about contextual similarity” and to provide “sufficient descriptive data” for the consumer to consider in comparing contexts (p. 298).

In addition to credibility and transferability, the researcher needs to ensure that the study is dependable. To establish dependability within a study, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the researcher must ensure consistency within the research design and a verifiable audit trail. Lincoln and Guba (1985) provided details on establishing an audit trail of the data to allow readers to concur that given the research parameters, the research is convincing and trustworthy.

The audit trail also helps to establish confirmability. To support the confirmability of a qualitative research project, the researcher should incorporate various methods to include reflexive journals, tape recordings, verified transcripts, field notes, and a log of activities throughout the study's entire duration (Gonzalez, 2004). Confirmability is a checkpoint that ensures that my interpretations and findings were grounded in their original context (Lincoln &

Guba, 1985). I used a peer debriefer to help preserve the notion of confirmability. I engaged in conversations and discussions with documented transcriptions of the interviews to substantiate the discussion. I ensured that I maintained a researcher reflexivity journal and expressed my beliefs, emotions, and the process used to construct my findings. I also ensured that I documented dates and times that were relevant to the study. I kept reflexive journals, tape recordings, transcripts, and detailed field notes to ensure maximum confirmability.

I interviewed academic managers on their respective campuses. I also included peer debriefing, allowing myself to analyze and synthesize data with a peer. I provided each participant with a copy of their interview(s), allowing them to approve and edit. I maintained field notes and recordings to create a verifiable audit trail. I kept a reflexive journal to document interactions and interpretations of participants, data, and environments and my developing insights.

Interviews

DeMarrais (2004) explained that interviews are “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in a conversation focused on questions related to a research study” (p. 55). The preferred interview structure for this study is a semi-structured approach. Merriam (2009) suggested that this format allows for the researcher to “respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging world view of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic” (p. 90). Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose five steps in carrying out a successful interview. The five steps are 1) deciding on whom to interview, 2) preparing for the interview, 3) initial moves, 4) pacing the interview and keeping it productive, and 5) terminating the interview and gaining closure. As the researcher, I decided on whom to interview based on the parameters of the study. I interviewed academic managers at doctoral-granting research-intensive land-grant institutions in the southwest United

States. I worked diligently with my chair, Dr. Lincoln, to decide the appropriate sequence of questions and practice the interview prior. During the initial phase of the interview, I recalled the nature and purpose of the interview with the participant and allowed for the initial discussion regarding their role and campus. I reviewed the questions with my chair and identified questions designed to probe, pump, and call for examples to ensure the interview pacing was productive. As a way to provide effective termination of the interview, I summarized a “play back” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 271) to the participant and allowed them to verify that I captured the information correctly.

Interviews were audiotaped, and the participants were notified via a consent form before the interview. The consent form included the study’s purpose, confidentiality measures, a reiteration of the academic manager’s voluntary participation, and withdrawal options. As part of the consent form, the researcher asked the participant to ensure a distraction-free location determined for the physical interview.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested for the researcher to “obtain confirmation that the report (transcription) has captured the data as constructed by the informant, or to correct, amend, or extend it, that is, to establish the credibility of the case” (p. 236). After the interviews, I transcribed the data, and a draft copy of the transcript was provided to the participant to allow for a member check. This process helped to ensure that there was a detailed audit trail to maximize validity. In addition to supporting the audit trail, Merriam (2009) concludes that “verbatim transcription of the recorded interviews provides the best database for analysis” (p. 110). In addition to the interviews, I collected demographic information about the participants to ensure the information is in the final report.

Observations

Lincoln and Guba (1985) argued that the significant advantage of direct observation is that it allows the researcher to gain an understanding of the “here-and-now experience in depth” (p. 273). Merriam (2009) described that “observation makes it possible to record behavior as it is happening” (p. 119) and that as an “outsider” the observer will be able to notice routine behavior among the participants. Observations are used to help triangulate the data in correlation with the interview and other findings (Merriam, 2009).

Observations took place on the academic manager’s campus in their natural environment. I also participated in a campus tour to allow for a deeper understanding and appreciation of the individual campus and its culture, facilities, and academic environments. The observations consisted of a full workday to allow for maximum observation of participant interactions. I requested to participate in leadership team meetings such as the dean’s council and department meetings.

I also attempted to participate in IRB workshops and engage with the Council of Principal Investigators while on campus. The impact of these two research functions provided additional information regarding academic capitalism and the commodification and commercialization of research.

Document Analysis

I reviewed current public documents regarding the institution’s academic promotion and tenure process. I complimented the interviews and observations by analyzing institutions' academic promotion and tenure process to triangulate the encroachment of capitalism within academia. I reviewed the institution’s promotion and tenure process throughout the last twenty years and provided a context of the evolution of the process.

The analysis provided a basis for additional research questions to surface as a result. “Documents provide background and context, additional questions to be asked, supplementary data, a means of tracking change and development, and verification of findings from other data sources” (Bowen, 2009).

Reflexivity & the Role of the Researcher

Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that a “reflexive journal might be thought of as providing the same kind of data about the human instrument that is often provided about the paper-and-pencil or brass instruments used in conventional studies” (p. 327). As the researcher within this study, I continued to maintain a reflexive journal throughout the study. Thus far, I have documented the process of selecting this research topic, meeting with my dissertation chair, the progress of the proposal, and my reflections as a researcher. During this study, I documented thick descriptions of my personal feelings, findings, questions, and discoveries. I kept a detailed log of my travel and daily schedule and a record of logistics regarding meetings, interviews, and correspondences associated with this study. The journal also benefited me in adding a component to the audit trail to bolster the study's trustworthiness.

Using the human as the primary instrument during this scientific exploration had implications. As a researcher, I was particularly interested in exploring academic capitalism for a variety of reasons. During my coursework as a doctoral student, I found this topic while taking a business and finance class. This topic was appealing because of its complexity and my ignorance of the issue. Second, I learned that academic capitalism impacts faculty work-life thus intriguing as it directly affects me as a graduate student studying higher education. Finally, as a higher education professional, my current position exemplifies academic capitalism to an extent, and I wanted to understand better how academic managers lead institutions during these times.

Data Analysis

As Lincoln and Guba (1985) explained, the naturalistic paradigm provides for the study's design to emerge as a result of continuous data analysis. The context of the study determined it. "The very requirement of an emergent design implies the presence of a continuously interacting and interpreting investigator. At times only simple refinements in procedure or a simple adjustment in questions to be asked may be called for, but at other times an investigator may strike out on a wholly new track as a result of a single insight" (Lincoln & Guba, p. 102-103).

I utilized Lincoln and Guba's (1985) content analysis method consisting of unitizing data, categorization, and identifying patterns. Unitization consists of units of information that will serve as "the basis for defining categories" (p. 344). Categorizing allows the researcher to "bring together into provisional categories... that relate to the same content" (Lincoln & Guba, 1981, p. 347), therefore allowing for patterns to emerge. "Patterns imply recurring regularities in the data, themes which occur frequently enough to suggest a shared reality (one or more)" (Gonzalez y Gonzalez, 2004, p. 50).

Unitizing Data & Coding

Lincoln and Guba (1985) described two characteristics of a unit:

First, it should be heuristic, that is, aimed at some understanding or some action that the inquirer needs to have or to take. Unless it is heuristic it is useless, however intrinsically interesting. Second, it must be the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself, that is, it must be interpretable in the absence of any additional information other than a broad understanding of the context in which the inquiry is carried out (p. 345).

I found units within interview notes, documents, nonverbal cues, and transcripts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Interviews were transcribed from audio files into Excel computer files. The transcripts were fragmented into units of data containing numbers and coded sources. The data was then

transferred to 4x6 index cards. All units were printed on index cards and include the source, type of respondent, site, and episode of encounter. Each of the individual index cards was coded to ensure maximum confidentiality and to allow the researcher to maintain an ethical audit trail to the original data source.

Categorization, Discovering Patterns, & Identifying Themes

Lincoln and Guba (1985) described the purpose of categorizing: “the essential tasks of categorizing are to bring together into provisional categories those cards that apparently relate to the same content” (p. 347). The first step in the categorization process allowed me to review the index cards and place them into categories with similar data forming themes. After I reviewed all index cards, the categories emerged from the various piles of index cards placed into different categories. I reviewed each category separately and identified the cards' common theme to name the category. The linking characteristic within each category served as the theme within that particular pile of index cards. I reviewed the stacks to ensure all cards in all categories were linked to the overall category. Miscellaneous cards combine into a separate pile for later review. To conclude this process, categories were evaluated for possible patterns and themes to emerge.

Conclusion

After careful review of various research methodologies, I wholeheartedly believe that qualitative research is the most effective methodology to explore the research questions that emerged from the literature. The literature provides sound evidence that higher education is in transition and that academic capitalism has impacted the academy. The research questions derived from the literature allowed academic managers to provide rich data about the future of higher education management. The philosophies of current academic managers had a direct

impact on the future of higher education. This research project provides an impactful document that outlines the skill sets needed for future academic managers to lead institutions.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

“If a fish were an anthropologist the last thing it would discover would be water.”

– Margaret Mead

Research Institutions and Participants

There were five participants within the study, and each of them represented a university within the southwest United States. All institutions were public land-grant universities, which were either research one or two institutions. Participants were current or recent academic managers who served as chancellors/presidents, provosts, or academic deans. Table 1 denotes the demographics and characteristics of institutions from which academic managers participated in the study.

TABLE 1

Institution’s Student Demographics							Institution’s Characteristics						
Enrollment	Gender		Ethnicity				Additional Factors						
	Female	Male	Caucasian	Hispanic	African American	Other	Faculty to Student Ratio	Research Expenditures	Land-Grant	Law School	Medical School	Research Status	Public Institution
27,600	54%	47%	73%	9%	4%	14%	18:1	\$163 M.	Yes	No	No	R1	Yes
24,041	50%	50%	66%	8%	4%	22%	20:1	\$144 M.	Yes	No	Yes	R1	Yes
31,761	54%	46%	66%	7%	13%	14%	20:1	\$129 M.	Yes	Yes	Yes	R1	Yes
14,296	57%	43%	27%	58%	2%	13%	17:1	\$110 M.	Yes	No	No	R2	Yes
69,465	47%	53%	51%	20%	3%	26%	20:1	\$952 M.	Yes	Yes	Yes	R1	Yes

**Data is from fall 2019 | Research expenditure data is represented by M. = millions*

There were one female and four male participants. The participant’s age, ethnicity, and academic position are represented in table 2.

TABLE 2

Participant’s Demographics			
	Age	Ethnicity	Gender
Chancellor/President	63	Caucasian	Male
Academic Dean	63	Caucasian	Male
Academic Dean	45	African American	Male
Academic Dean	57	Caucasian	Male
Former Provost*	63	Caucasian	Female

**Interview was arranged and scheduled at one institution, and the provost canceled. The former provost agreed to participate and was the immediate past provost less than one year removed.*

Academic Manager’s Perception of the Term “Academic Capitalism”

As part of this research study, I explored what academic managers think about academic capitalism and how they define it. I designed the first research question precisely to extract academic managers’ perceptions of academic capitalism as a term. In every interview, I asked each academic manager, “How do managers define academic capitalism?” Overwhelmingly, academic managers did not know how to define academic capitalism. A few researched the topic as they agreed to participate in the study and received the interview questions before my arrival. Perhaps what was most interesting is that not only were they unsure how to define it, but they agreed that most of the administration on their campuses are unaware of the phenomenon.

During my visits, I was permitted to participate in leadership team meetings led by academic managers. In one of the leadership team meetings, the academic manager asked me to describe my study's focus. I answered, and later during the interview, the participant stated that

“when I was listening to you when you were talking about how you got engaged in this topic and... and what you do. This....term academic capitalism is completely foreign, I believe, to everybody that is here at the university” (Participant 1). Another participant responded to the question by stating, “when I go to Provost meetings and things like that, it’s not a term we talked about” (Participant 5). Another described an academic dean’s perception of academic capitalism, “I think they would deny that there is a concept of academic capitalism in a sense that, I think they don’t want to see what other people call the corporatization of the university. They don’t look at that because their function is mainly an academic one” (Participant 1).

Participant 2 indicated that “I don’t hear them [administration] using that term much, okay? So, I had to do a little reading myself. But, we talk about it, just.... without using the terminology.” Participant 4 responded by saying that, “I’ve got a Ph.D. in business, so when I think of capital I think of financial capital, but I think capitalism is more of a business perspective and academic viewing the university more as a business as opposed to a social experiment” [human capital].

From the onset of this research project, there were indications that academic managers did not understand academic capitalism. In this particular instance (Participant 4), how could it be that an academic manager leading an academic unit did not understand the difference between financial and human capital? Perhaps the participant had never paused to reflect or consider that higher education is a social experiment. Bontis, Dragonetti, Jacobsen, and Roos (1999) defined human capital as the human factor of any organization. “Human capital represents the human factor in the organization; the combined intelligence, skills, and expertise that gives the organization its distinctive character. The human elements of the organization are those that are capable of learning, changing, innovating and providing the creative thrust which if properly

motivated can ensure the long-run survival of the organization” (Bontis, etl., 1999, pg. 393). The implications of not understanding human capital as a factor within the institution can be detrimental to the faculty, staff, and students who are led by uninformed academic managers.

Higher education is a social experiment. It is not exclusively a for-profit entity designed to produce high yields on investments to fulfill the pockets of shareholders. Higher education institutions were created in the medieval period to transmit knowledge and provide training to professionals and have evolved into much more complex organizations continuing to create knowledge and distribute it globally. Reduced financial resources and a stronger connection to society and the alignment with the workforce industry have had major impacts on higher education. Both have transformed higher education and without understanding the foundation, academic managers could misinterpret the purpose of higher education. Higher education does involve knowledge transfer, testing reactions to knowledge, and the development of new points of view. Hence the reason it is important for academic managers to, at the bare minimum, recognize the implications of capitalism on higher education institutions.

There were three instances when the participants provided thoughts about academic capitalism and its impact on higher education. One participant indicated that academic capitalism means “taking things like research and thinking more about how we’re going to make money from doing the research instead of how we’re going to serve the greater good” (Participant 5). Another participant responded by saying, “I think that managers define their academic capitalism specifically to the areas they manage” (Participant 1). Finally, one participant indicated that he wasn’t sure that “academic capitalism is responsible for all the redefinition (of higher education)” (Participant 1).

Academic capitalism is nuanced, and the implications are indeed redefining higher education at almost every level. Academic managers who participated in the study revealed that higher education leadership is unaware of the phenomenon that they are currently navigating. Although some academic managers had ideas and could articulate some academic capitalism functions, none had a holistic and in-depth understanding of the term and its implications on managing higher education in a new era. Academic managers are navigating a new higher education environment entrenched with academic capitalism, responding to their changing environment dominated by a neoliberal philosophy. Most academic managers are navigating their new environment without a holistic understanding of the phenomenon that surrounds them. To translate Margaret Mead's quote to higher education, academic managers seem to be the fish in the water, never thinking to stop and discover their environment.

Three Themes that Impact Academic Managers

Kevin McClure coined the term "Administrative Academic Capitalism" in his 2016 article titled "Building the Innovative and Entrepreneurial University: An Institutional Case Study of Administrative Academic Capitalism." His research concluded that academic managers are engaged in the corporate management of academic capitalism. Although most academic managers are unaware of their redefined environment, they are engaged, and their leadership perpetuates academic capitalism. In synthesizing the research data, three themes of non-profit corporate management emerged from interviews with the participants. The three themes identified from the data are entrepreneurship, competitiveness, and accountability. The findings suggest that academic managers are leading institutions with corporate management techniques. The themes emerging from the data indicate that higher education moves away from a long-held and closely regarded collegial work environment to a highly competitive environment where

capitalism, disguised as entrepreneurship and accountability, drives decision-making and management.

In what follows, I will present each of the three themes in addition to substantive research to qualify and quantify how they emerged from the data. First, entrepreneurialism has come to serve as a central component in the operation of higher education. Research indicates that reduced state funding has indeed impacted higher education, not only by amplifying the public versus private good debate but by requiring institutions to seek outside resources and additional revenue streams through enrollment growth and strategic partnerships. Next, entrepreneurialism leads to competitiveness that has shifted academic managers to pursue and glorify prestige, rankings, and enrollment. The data shows that the increased competition has led to innovation and creation, but has directly impacted the once highly-regarded collegial higher education environment. Then, data reflects how reduced state funding, along with increased tuition, has also shifted the mindset of state legislatures and external constituents to demand greater accountability within higher education. Lastly, academic managers now manage institutions as non-profit corporations. These practices have impacted campus shared governance. They have also created a highly competitive collegiate environment. Participants suggested future skills academic managers will need to lead higher education institutions in this brave new world.

Theme One: The Rise of Educational Entrepreneurialism

The drastic decline in state funding of higher education institutions has required academic managers to seek new revenue sources that will allow them to lead striving universities. The interviews' data suggest that academic managers engage in educational entrepreneurialism in two segments, creating new revenue streams for their institutions. The other is developing and capitalizing on external partnerships to support infrastructure and scholarship. One of the

research questions asked of each participant was, “How do academic managers deal with reduced funding from state and federal agencies?” Each participant responded with an affirmative statement indicating that reduced state funding has altered operations at their institution.

Participant 1 said that his institution started “cutting where they can and being more efficient at operations.” He continued, “we’ve got to figure out ways to find other revenue sources or to become better at what we do, and I think that’s how managers are dealing with reduced funding. Even deans, I think, realize that they need to find new sources of revenue for programming within their college, but they also have to be more efficient in the way they operate.”

Participant 2 responded, saying, “there’s a couple of things you can do. One is to find another source of revenue. The other is to trim and trim and try to keep doing what you’re doing with less money. The third is to stop doing something.” Participant 3 responded to the question bluntly, stating that his colleagues needed to create “variable revenue streams.” When pressed, he provided examples of what variable revenue streams were within his college. He explained by stating that,

Okay, one, sponsored research. The more sponsored research, the more grants -the more contracts that we get.... I have direct access to that. Also, that’s why we get so invested in online learning, because [name of institution] overall is behind our peers in online learning. The university was very generous in incentivizing the colleges and gave us a lot of control over those funds once we brought them in. So, once we grow, right away, there’s a stream of revenue that we have control over that’s not dependent on any other agency. Same thing with professional ed, so all of the kind of training and workshops.... that’s our money. We control that. Summer school is the same way; summer school revenues come back to us.

Participant 4 stated, “You try to find other sources of revenue either through fundraising or professional programs; those are two ways to go. External grants from the government... sometimes corporate support from foundations... like the Koch Brothers – their foundation funds a lot of things in Academia.” He implicated academic managers saying that, “a lot of the regular

schools are struggling because there's a lack of state funding. And then you know other funding sources are limited. And so a lot ofacademic managers.... make short-term decisions that look good on paper that will get them their next job because they know that....their shelf life is going to be three to five years.”

Participant 5 replied to the question by saying, “When the state funding went down, and we had to rely on tuition, what you find yourself when you're relying on tuition only, talk to all the private schools.” She indicated that at her institution, deans who wanted to implement differential tuition like private schools had to make a strong case, “before they can go up for differential tuition, they had to make a case to me for how it was really going to help their students and their prestige.” Their arguments for differential tuition included time to degree, retention, and career positioning.

All of the participants gave explicit examples of how reduced state funding has required them to become more entrepreneurial in their management to secure additional revenue sources to operate. All participants cited market-driven and corporate practices from the highest academic manager (chancellor) to the lowest ranking academic manager interviewed (academic dean). As state funding has shifted, incorporating market-driven and corporate practices has become more common within higher education. As the literature suggested, academic managers are becoming more entrepreneurial in their leadership. From my assessment, they incorporate more educational entrepreneurialism out of a necessity to fund their organization while striving to improve prestige. The participants supported the point that reduced state funding has created an environment that requires, facilitates, and perpetrates educational entrepreneurialism.

One academic manager compared academia to a business enterprise sharing that academics with no business backgrounds can “be a little mystified by thebusiness enterprise

that we are operating in...the taxpayers of America are not going to just continue to throw bags of money over the castle walls. And I think some people are having a hard time grasping that which is tough, because the environment and higher education is changing so much” (Participant 4).

The Need to Increase Revenue and Resources

Slaughter and Leslie (1997) researched academic capitalism, and in one of their closing chapters, the authors provide a detailed explanation of resource dependence and changing patterns of national higher education finance. They concluded that “general public funds for higher education declined when considered in constant dollars per student. However, revenue shares from other sources such as sales and service increased, as did shares from tuition. Private gifts, grants, and contracts, and sales and services were also up” (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p. 215). They explained that universities are challenged with “problems of a resource-dependent nature” (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997, p. 215).

This study examined how academic managers lead their institutions in attaining revenue and resources in this exemplified resource-dependent era. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) revealed that private gifts, grants, contracts, and sales were up in 1997. How does that compare to 2019? Were there additional areas of revenue and resources for which academic managers were now competing? How did academic managers facilitate, lead, and compete for those new resources? Four questions solicited responses from participants regarding entrepreneurial activity related to revenue and resources: 1) How does entrepreneurial activity in higher education impact the institution? 2) How has the incorporation of market-like activities impacted higher education? 3) The neo-liberal state has enacted laws that have created a new economy. How has the new

economy impacted higher education? 4) What do academic managers think about the shift of research from the public good to the modern commodification of research?

Academic managers cited the same external revenue sources mentioned in Slaughter and Leslie's 1997 study in their quest to compete for revenue and resources. Participants noted the expansion of external partnerships to include commercialize and sponsored research along with grants. Also, there was a revenue source that had become more prominent and cited by academic managers: tuition and enrollment. Tuition and enrollment have become a significant revenue source for higher education institutions, as states have reduced funding. Participants were from five different states: three participants were at institutions where the state does not regulate their tuition rates, which allowed their university to set tuition rates. The other two participants were at institutions where the state does regulate its tuition rates. All five participants indicated that tuition and enrollment were a significant source of revenue for their institution.

The Impact of Enrollment Growth and Why it is Priority

The research indicates that academic managers have emphasized enrollment and tuition as a supplement to institutional budgets that have been impacted by reduced state funding. The importance of enrollment marketing has increasingly become critical as academic managers strive to expand enrollment by increasing: online/distance education, summer school, stackable certificates, international students, professional programs, and new degree programs and centers. Participant 2 indicated that "historically the money just came and, of course as budget cuts have happened, the world just kind of changed. We really have a greater responsibility, as deans, to be generating revenue where before it was – maybe I'm being naïve about it – but before, it was generally just given." Participant 1 conducted a budget review and stated that, "in the year 1999-2000, just 18 years ago, if you looked at how our budget was constructed, 70% of our budget

came from the state and 30% came from tuition. So, now that's completely flipped, where 75 – almost 80%, I'd say 80% now comes from tuition, and 20% comes from the state." Participant 5 shared that "there is making money from research, but there has also been an effort probably as long or longer to make money from the students, and that's our bigger capitalistic, way bigger funding on what we're going to have and how we're going to survive, than trying to turn research into money."

Participant 3 described how "we missed our numbers, and you know how that works for us, 700 students under basically place us about a 10-million-dollar deficit." When I asked what enrollment growth means to that institution, the participant bluntly stated, "it's everything!" Academic managers are focused so highly on enrollment because of the financial implications of higher education funding models that have shifted from state-funded to state-supported or state-located.

Interestingly, interviews and observations with the participants revealed that not only has external funding for higher education shifted but so too has funding within the university itself. The majority of this study participants reported that their institution had established and promoted college-specific revenue accounts managed by individual academic managers. These revenue accounts allowed for the generation and expenditure of funding from revenue-generating initiatives. These initiatives varied by institution but included: online enrollment, summer enrollment, certificates, professional programs, camps, differential tuition, and external grants. One of the primary areas that academic managers are looking to expand to offset budget shortfalls is expanding online enrollment.

Academic managers widely discussed the importance of online enrollment and how offering additional online classes could subsidize their institution's budget. Participant 3

indicated that “the director of enrollment management and our director of online learning – they sit next to the provost, and they’re like her right-hand people. A part of it is because the only way that we’re going to be able to....I’m not even talking about growth.... I mean just maintain -- is you have to have more revenue from student enrollment; it’s got to happen. I mean that’s.... it’s critical.” All of the leadership team meetings that I had an opportunity to sit in during the day observations revealed that online enrollment and the development and maintenance of an online presence was a high priority for academic managers.

I could obtain three meeting agendas during the meetings with various leadership teams, and each had a specific agenda item related to enrollment and online offerings. During my observation with participant 3, I participated in the academic leadership team meeting. The team dedicated twenty-three minutes of an hour-long session to discussing their “Online Council” and how the push for online enrollment was one of their steps to meeting their enrollment projection. During my time at participant 2’s institution, I participated in the Provost Leadership Council, composed of all academic deans and enrollment management administration. Of a ninety-minute meeting, the provost dedicated 60 minutes to enrollment. The group had a third-party vendor present the institution’s newly-redesigned website that they specifically commissioned to develop further and enhance enrollment. After the presentation, the provost scheduled the remaining thirty minutes of the meeting to discuss how to move two specific programs online to recruit additional students. This institution debated how to offer an online bachelor’s of nursing in science (BSN) degree program. They charged the third-party vendor to streamline steps for students to enroll and create an online environment where online degree offerings were prominent. Participant 2 said this was to “make this an experience that attracts a certain

audience....let's use the online platform to attract people who....still see the value in having a degree from our institution.”

During my campus visit for participant 1's interview, I was allowed to sit in the Executive Cabinet Meeting, including the chancellor, all vice presidents, and the provost. The council dedicated a quarter of the two-hour meeting to Student Affairs and how to increase enrollment. Much of the discussion revolved around how this institution needed to incentivize adjunct faculty to offer and teach more online classes. The chief financial officer presented a very detailed plan of online learning advantages and how it could save the institution money by reducing electricity, janitorial service, and in-person services such as the student union, advising, etc. Although online learning is becoming more sophisticated and requested by students, it seemed as if the interest to offer online classes by academic managers originated from a revenue generation perspective rather than from the perspective of meeting student demand. All conversations observed and responses to interview questions from academic managers regarding online learning and enrollment indicate that institutions' priorities increase revenue to address budget shortfalls. During the campus visits and the interviews, academic managers did not suggest through conversations that they were interested in students' success rates taking online classes or the faculty's impact on converting their curriculum to a synchronous or asynchronous online learning environment. Participant 4 pointed out how tenured research faculty are less likely to teach online and how non-tenured and adjunct faculty primarily will take on the online courses taught at that institution. Participant 4 described, “So you've got a faculty member producing research that isn't that valuable or in demand making two-hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. And then to compensate for that, you're hiring a bunch of adjuncts who have master's degrees, and for that, you're paying them \$5,500 a course. So, you've got a lot of these

instructors, but they're doing it full time. They're trying to teach at one university and then taking up online courses at other universities.”

Participant 2 discussed how specific colleges at that institution struggle with online enrollment, while others are thriving.

I think it has forced us to think about how we reach our audience because others are reaching them....where we aren't. Arizona State, of course, took a big step in that direction where they went so aggressively online and to create every degree program available online, and expanded their enrollment tens of thousands by doing so. You see some early adopters like that or sort of mega adopters like Arizona State. I think we're struggling with that here, you know this college, the engineering college, arts & sciences to some extent, are much more active online than what our college is. They're bringing in a lot more revenue, and right now the model rewards them for that, the vice president wants to change the model because he thinks it's taking revenue away from our traditional budget, but so, you know, I think the strategy at [name of institution] is we've got to be there in the online environment and responding in a nonconformist way.

Participant 1 shared that deans at that institution “have turned to distance education programs in their particular colleges for revenue that is outside of the university.” Participant 1 indicated that academic managers have to figure out how to “find other revenue sources or to become better at what we do at that institution.” Participant 3 shared that they have a

80/20 split, meaning 20% of all online revenue comes to the dean's office, and the other 80% goes to the school that program is housed in. We made that cut so drastically because we really wanted to incentivize the schools to get involved in online learning because a lot of faculty just don't want to do it. They thought it was a bad idea; that's not what they were trained to do. Well, now that the culture is shifting and we're starting to get more faculty involved, and they've been able to generate a lot of funds.

As institutions look to recruit and offer more online classes and degree programs, academic managers also indicate that they will also expand offerings during the summer sessions to increase enrollment and budget shortfalls.

During one of the Dean's Council meetings that I had the opportunity to attend, it was evident that in addition to the push for online enrollment, there was also a decision to reallocate funding to hire an administrator within this particular college to lead the further development of

online classes. One of the items listed on the meeting agenda was creating an Associate Dean of Online Learning for this college. The expectations discussed relative to this position were leading the development of expanding online classes within the college and offering professional development for faculty to convert the curriculum from in-person to online.

Participant 3 shared that summer school also provides an additional revenue stream and the online education revenue stream. “Summer school revenues come back to us.” Participant 3 shared why it is crucial to not only have multiple revenue streams but to expand them, noting that “any stream of revenue that we have control over that we do not have to depend on the state, academic affairs, any other body to govern...if I need to grow extra...where can I get extra revenue from that I don't have to worry about anybody cutting out the top?”

Online and summer enrollment are two methods that academic managers focus on to increase funding for their institutions. One additional strategy that surfaced from the research is the growing number of graduate and undergraduate certificates that institutions are developing to increase enrollment and credentialing. Participant 2 referenced the target audience for certificates during the interview stating, “So most of them right now are basically appealing to customers we already have. So, while you're here working on your master's degree, you could get a certificate in this also. So, it adds a little value to the credential they've already signed up for. What we want to do with that [certificates] is, take it to help us reach audiences beyond.” Most institutions offer certificates in addition to degrees as a method to increase conditional admittance, thereby offering enrollment to those students who don't meet their outline admissions criteria but will take leveling courses to get a certificate and full admission into a particular program. Participant 2 also stated that “you've heard [name of institution] talk about certificates and the graduate dean is hot on that as well. That look, let's – not everything had to result in a degree – there are other

things we can do that use education to add value for someone – let’s keep that door open rather than saying, well, that’s not our domain. So, it’s, you know, I think that’s been a good direction for us to go.”

Later during the interview, participant 2 gave an explicit example of how the college they oversee offers and benefits from certificates. They stated that,

So, food safety is an area we really feel we have an opportunity to have an impact. And ah-we deliver a food science major with a minor in um food safety at the undergraduate level. We aren’t getting enough students going into that; the industry keeps telling us we need more, we need more, because of changes in food laws and so on. And ah, so we said okay, let’s, let’s expand this. Let’s make that minor available to students in industrial engineering, let’s make it available to students in microbiology-Other colleges on campus, and while we’re at it, let’s make a graduate certificate available so they may be working on an MBA over here, but if they have some technical expertise, maybe they’ve been working at a food company, let’s give them an opportunity to add this certificate. Um so, we get the revenue from them, we get greater presence, if you will, through alumni and that kind of thing. I hope we can go with that to be able to go to [City] and [City] where a lot of food companies are based and say: we got a deal for your employees. They don’t have to get a master’s degree, but they can, but if they want to start out they can just work on this food safety certificate.

Another avenue that academic managers are focusing on is international enrollment.

International registration helps an institution increase revenue: 1) international students pay a substantially larger amount of money to attend, and 2) they must take in-person courses that equate to full-time status, increasing the number of credit hours. Almost every participant interviewed noted the desire to increase international student enrollment and how globalization had changed their interaction with foreign countries. Many academic managers have also identified how their institutions can further develop international relationships to recruit students and build relationships with other countries to offer US students the opportunity to travel abroad and be exposed to a global environment. Participant 1 indicated that at that institution, “we have more students that are participating in international experiences than ever before and I think it’s again the perception that it’s not good enough to not just know something about XXX [state the

university is located in], how you do science in XXX [state the university is located in] or whatever, but it's a global stage that we're actually playing on, and so I think it's having a huge impact on us."

Participant 2 shared how international students fill the gap of declining enrollment and the demographics of students in the US. "Here in the business school in management science and information systems... or something like that... he has a lot of international students, MBA international students so it created opportunities for us to, in a way, fill seats that were being vacated by the reduced number of students from the US. So part of that is demographics, population trends declining, birth rates, and so on and so international students are filling those gaps that we've had." Participant 5 further endorsed the reality of the impact of enrolling international students as they described international enrollment as a "revenue generator." "I think for a lot of schools it has become a revenue generator. I come from engineering, where we have a lot of international students in the graduate programs."

Participant 5 also gave an example of how another institution utilized international student fees, "the University of Illinois, thirty years ago, charged \$10,000, a flat fee of \$10,000 and along with out-of-state tuition to international students. Now, they used that \$10,000 to send their own students... undergraduates to study abroad and stuff. So, as a good reason, they wouldn't have been able to do that without international students... a lot of graduate programs would die without the international students." Institutions have relied on international students to increase enrollment and revenue now more than ever. However, due to the current political climate with the recent US presidential administration, academic managers fear that international students will begin to opt to attend institutions in other countries over the US. Participant 3

shared their thoughts on the historical context and current environment of international education:

after World War II, the way that the United States became the global leader: we won the war, and we funneled the resources of parts of Europe, Africa, and Asia directly back to the US. As we rebuilt countries, we rebuilt them by basically using our educational system as the model. So, everybody loved the US because we provided the education. That shifted radically in the last 30 to 40 years. And you could make the case this current iteration of American policy shows you taking this kind of globalism, and if you want to be a global country, you want to dominate the resources, but we've also started now to close off our borders and so there's about to see a significant shift. I don't think its new, but I do think this is a ripple, um, and an ongoing, continuous kind of change of where the US sits in the market.

Participant 2 shared that they oversaw an international exchange program that their predecessor created with China to increase its college revenue. Participant 2 observed that their college has a:

memorandum of agreement with China Agricultural University in Beijing for a [sic] undergraduate, joint degree program. Students who finish it receive a bachelor's degree in agri-business from [XXX] and a bachelor's degree in farm management, I think it's what it's called, from China Agricultural University. They spend two years in Beijing, all instruction in English, and then two years here all in English and while they are here they're paying out of state tuition and they're paying full load – there's no discount. So, to the extent that we're generating new revenue for the university, actually, my predecessor made a deal with the Vice President of Administration and the Provost that we would get some of that financial return coming to the college, and we're using that to support the program to have an academic advisor who works exclusively with these students and helps them with the cultural transitions and so on. So, it's bringing revenue, and it's also bringing prestige. The first class graduated a year ago, May 25, graduates. Nineteen of them were going on to master's degrees at leading universities: Cornell, UC-Davis, Texas A&M, Florida, and so on. So, we're not only getting the dollar value, but we're getting the reputation value having them represent us going off to these other graduate programs. We're adding value to them because we've demonstrated that they can study and succeed in an English-language curriculum.

This academic manager views this program as a revenue-generating initiative that includes increased headcount and credit hours, along with prestige and reputation.

The evidence makes clear that academic managers respond to the new era of academic capitalism by consistently implementing revenue-generating and entrepreneurial activity to

support the increase in headcount and credit hours to help offset reduced funding from the state. In addition to enrollment, participants also indicated that they, now more than ever, are leveraging external partnerships to secure additional resources that otherwise would not be available to them.

Expand External Partnerships

Partnering with external entities has become common practice within higher education. There are several ways in which higher education institutions partner with external entities. Harclerod and Eaton (2011) refer to external partnerships as “hidden hands” within higher education. The authors categorize higher education’s hidden hands into three sectors: voluntary enterprise, public enterprise, and private enterprise. The voluntary enterprise sector is primarily composed of nonprofit organizations. These nonprofit organizations can range from community-based foundations to national independent foundations. “By their choice of areas to finance, foundations, especially those in the national independent category, entice supposedly autonomous colleges to do things they might not do otherwise” (Harclerod and Eaton, 2011, pg. 199). In this study, such organizations were described as local community-based foundations that partnered with universities for college readiness and success.

The second sector is the public enterprise. Harclerod and Easton (2011) denote that this particular sector includes local, state, and federal governments. Examples of public enterprise partnerships within this study include grants from the Department of Defense and state higher education associations. The final sector is the private enterprise. The private sector includes “profit-seeking businesses and commerce” (Harclerod and Eaton, 2011, pg. 196). Within this study, the private enterprise was most referenced and included industry partners such as Walmart, Blue Cross Blue Shield, and Exxon.

All five participants cited external partnerships as an essential aspect of entrepreneurial leadership within their respective institutions. By nature, these partnerships provide revenue and resources to their institutions via commercializable research, sponsored research, collaborative research, grants, and intellectual property. Academic managers rely heavily on faculty to identify, solicit, and attain external monies and support to help fund salaries, research, and graduate students. Academic managers lead by supporting and promoting their entrepreneurial faculty to solicit, maintain, and exploit external partnerships. Additionally, they cited the importance and impact on the tenure review process, specifically with those who could attain external monies.

Participant 4 shared that at their institution, they are trying to find other revenue sources with external grants, “External grants from the government... sometimes corporate support from foundations... like the Koch Brothers, their foundation funds a lot of things in Academia.” Participant 1 indicated that “there are more partnerships between the universities and private businesses than there ever has been. We’re seeing an uptick in funding that comes from the private sector for some of the research work that goes on.”

Local businesses and foundations support partnerships with universities as they can directly benefit from the research and convert the findings to increase production, resulting in greater profits. These partnerships allow for faculty to generate reserved revenue that designates funding for graduate assistantships, internships, and conference travel. In some instances, this designated funding is in addition to the funding allocated to research expenses: labs, technology, human resources, etc. For instance, participant 1 shared that their institution was in a great position as the local industry enjoyed partnerships.

We’re in sort of a unique position right here because the increasing entrepreneurial activity is a goal of the business community that’s here in XXX (area). It’s a huge goal

and so they're actually supporting that goal financially, in some respects, by helping us fund programs and help our students and our faculty to become better entrepreneurs with the research and the work that they're doing.

The partnership described above is coded as "industry partnerships" but in reality, it is corporate-directed research. Although the institution does receive funding for the research, the intent and outcome are driven by a corporate entity rather than the curiosity of scholarship.

Harclerod and Eaton (2011) provide perhaps the most accurate and strongest critique of external partnerships.

Private constituencies have a significant impact on institutional autonomy and academic freedom. Much of this impact is positive, supportive, and welcome. However, those that provide funds can affect institutional trends and directions by determining what types of academic programs or research efforts are supported. As federal and state monies tighten up even more in the years ahead, funds from alternate sources will become even more attractive. Acceptance of grants moves institutions in the directions dictated by the funding sources, and faculties are well advised to consider this possibility as the 'crunch' of the twenty-first century becomes greater (Harclerod and Eaton, 2011, pg. 223).

The Role of Faculty in Commercializeable Research

Not only are these partnerships being sought by academic managers, but faculty are also taking on a role in finding, nurturing, and expanding external partnerships. Participant 2 shared that, "We have faculty who see themselves in a way maybe as entrepreneurial in terms of developing relationships with funders." They went on to describe the benefits of faculty who engage in entrepreneurial partnerships, "that drive, that freedom to pursue innovation, I think, is really good for the institution... and in order to get that sense of freedom faculty need to have some freedom to pursue avenues of supporting the work that they're wanting to do."

Academic managers stated that it is encouraged for faculty to seek external partnerships to generate grant funding for their research, but it is also somewhat required. Participant 2 indicated that

a successful faculty member in my college is only going to be successful if they're going out and getting the grants to conduct their research. Basically, we're providing them a salary, now you go get the money to bring on the grad students, the technician you need, you know, your service contract on your PC, our machines, whatever.

Participant 5 added that their institution moved into AAU membership because of their ability to take research grant dollars and push the money down directly to the lowest level (faculty) as much as possible,

All research grants went back to the individual faculty and their department whereas at most universities it stays central. And because we did that, people came and would stay because they could be entrepreneurial. They can make the decision; I want to send my graduate student to this conference. Well that few thousand of dollars they got back in indirect return they could use to send their own student instead of having to beg the vice president for research for some dollars.

The literature suggests that the encroachment of academic capitalism has adversely impacted faculty. There are additional responsibilities associated with being a faculty member during this new era. One new expectation is to seek external funding to support research and scholarship through external partnerships. Academic managers reinforced that they expect faculty to partner with funders to secure grant dollars to help subsidize their research and scholarship. Participant 2 described in great detail how academic managers provide support:

we're going to provide a workshop, its free, we'll pay for you to go through this workshop on writing grants, writing effective grant proposals, um we will um, we've got some funds you know we've collected some discretionary funds, some FFA return funds, we're going to make those available on a competitive basis. Write a proposal for startup funding, or for a pilot study, 50,000 dollars for each year, for two years, uh-write a proposal. And uh, and you'll be competing with others- so you know there's only 250,000 dollars available. So, there will only be five awards... You want to be one of those five. So, you know, you can create incentives like that, I mean its carrots that attract them to do what you want them to do. And then you reward that if they are successful, productive, and so on and say okay, here you go. Now our expectation is there will be a proposal that comes out of this that goes off to NSF or our USDA or whoever. So, you know to constantly be involved in delivering that message um directly from, you know, the research administrator as well as ah, from the department head.

Participant 1 shared how their university partners with Walmart to sponsor research for their supply chain management department for both to benefit:

It behooves them to invest in the supply chain because that's what Walmart is all about in a lot of respects, is how do you get products to people. We've seen over the years investments that they'll make in the university in the basic research that goes on in that area as well as applied research that they may find.

Participant 2 also shared how their university partners with external industries to connect faculty with industry who will support their research:

the habit has been to go to the industry directly, and so we end up with agreements from Dow AgroScience, and now it's Corteva... they Dow DuPont merger, Monsanto now Bayer, Genta, and BASF. So, we have funding relationships with them so faculty are out there are generating revenue for their research and extension programs from that.

Participant 2 described how these particular partnerships are established independent of faculty.

New faculty and junior faculty who are needing to generate scholarships for the tenure review process are able to connect with pre-established partners to accept previously agreed upon industry-directed research and funding.

Although there are established partnerships with external entities to support research, participant 1 shared how faculty at their institution often desired more support with commercializing their research. Participant 1 shared,

I've had more faculty members come up to me and say, "I really wish we did commercialization better here at XXX because I have work that I think is commercializeable that I can make money on as an entrepreneur in the future and that I have intellectual property that I think is sellable and we don't have any infrastructure put in place for you to help me do that. You'll help me do my research with a research office, but you won't help me do that.

Faculty might request for institutions to help support the commercialization of their research, but as participant 2 indicated,

I think where we get into controversy is where you write a nondisclosure agreement with a private firm who has funded the research, and you give up that public part. I think we have to be very careful in calculating that and accounting for the public investment that's

implicit whenever a faculty member is engaged in that kind of work. Now, if they apply to something outside the institution, there's a process for them to do that, where they can go off and spend two years on unpaid leave, work in a private firm and develop something there and so on. I mean, it's negotiated how much ownership the university gives up in that. Um, but you know, the university is open to that. But you know if the persons working here, are being paid with university funds and they get some funding from a corporation to do some research, there's still a public investment in that, and so, I think the university has to be very careful not to give away the value of that public investment exclusively to the private firm. Some of it still has to be retained at the university. That's my opinion anyway.

This phenomenon adds to the discussion of whether higher education today is a public or private good. When state and federal governments valued institutions as a public good they funded not only institutional operations but faculty-directed research as well. The above-mentioned instance sheds light on the implications on scholarship and faculty as research has shifted from faculty-directed to industry-directed. It is evident that there is no public good when faculty are engaged in research where the outcomes are aligned exclusively for corporate profits. Under the new higher education funding model institutions and scholars seek additional resources outside of the university and prioritize industry-directed research where nondisclosure agreements can be required.

Industry-directed research led by public agents (faculty) causes a unique contradiction of principles. How can faculty whose salary is paid for by public funds - generated by local, state, and federal taxes - be allowed to exhaust time, use state equipment, and institutional resources on research that exclusively benefits corporate profits? In most instances, faculty have acquired research skills, experience, and notoriety as advanced research scholars during their time at universities where much of the start-up and continual research funding came from public funds. The commercialization of research challenges traditional principles of higher education and as a result, requires academic managers to safeguard public interest to the extent allowed under the law. As Slaughter and Rhoades (2011, p.459) stated, "Many states have adjusted their conflict-

of-interest laws so that universities and faculty can hold equity positions in private corporations, even when those corporations do business with universities.” These laws have been lobbied for by higher education institutions to ensure that they are allowed to engage in new opportunities created by a new economy (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2011).

Participants indicated that faculty were interested in commercializing their research. They also shared how it is improbable for faculty and institutions to strike it rich by producing scholarship that converts into monetary capital. Participant 5 cautioned by stating,

I’ve served on a lot of national committees and the overall success of turning research into big bucks is very low, and most of us recognize that. So, emphasizing research, there is this non-academicians, regents, and legislators and stuff who say okay, maybe like a corporation, and invest in things that are going to do research to make big money, but the academicians overall know that. That’s a chance you can do some things for the good, and you can do some things to try to not lose money, but hitting it big and that arena, I think that people say it’s happened three or five times. So, it’s never going to be a major source of funding for the guys from the corporate world who think it is... I don’t think they’re being very realistic, but we’ll see.

Participant 4 shared a similar concern,

In most instances, recent academic research is a money losing proposition. Every now and then, if you’re at Stanford, you’ll hit it big, but for the most part, academic research in the hard sciences, which is externally funded, tends to break even. Research in the humanities and in business, which is university-funded typically, there’s no external funding, is a real huge money losing proposition, and I’m not sure if everybody in higher ed fully understands that.

The Impact of External Funding on Science and Engineering

The external partnerships that generate grant dollars can be disproportionate for all of the colleges and faculty within academia. Although participants indicated that there was an expectation for faculty to seek grant funding, they also provided reasons why faculty in the social sciences and humanities would have less success in retrieving these funds than their STEM counterparts. Participant 5 shared how AAU measured their university with several areas of emphasis, including how much federal research dollars per faculty FTE. In evaluating the deans

within that institution, participant 5 indicated that they would share the following, “One of the measures is federal research dollars per faculty FTE, and some of you may be doing very well for your area, but you will never do as well as Chemistry can do.”

Participant 1 shared how external partnerships can create an unfair advantage with the science and engineering departments compared to other areas.

All of these areas can lead to entrepreneurial activity that starts in the university and makes its way outside and off-campus. It’s setting a system up where a faculty member, it doesn’t matter the area that they’re in, can have access to this assistance, but it’s more likely that it’s going to happen in engineering, in physics, in chemistry, in biology, and a few other areas like that.

Participant 1 went on to share that in addition to the science and engineering fields having an unfair advantage from external partners, their institution supported faculty in those areas more than others.

For our faculty, we can invest in entrepreneurial activity, particularly as it relates to research, sometimes this is more specific to the STEM areas where there’s commercializable research that goes on. What that means for us is making sure that our offices are set-up to be able to help a faculty member who wants to not only be a great teacher and a great researcher but wants to be an entrepreneur as well.

Participant 3 reinforced the inequity of entrepreneurial opportunities via external partnerships available for colleges outside of STEM.

The folks like basic sciences, engineering... the kind of STEM-related areas, even though, you know the ‘E’ in stem... represents what we do and also our School of Kinesiology is very much related to the STEM areas. But I think given that, you know, we’re an energy school... we are a Department of Defense kind of school... energy, Halliburton, Exxon, NASA, you know, Department of Defense... those are the kind of places where a lot of our large grants come from, and so given the country’s focus on STEM, and it’s applicability to a lot of entrepreneurial ventures, at times creates an inequity for those areas that aren’t viewed as closely tied to the market in general.

Participant 2 shared how their institution utilized plant patents to generate revenue for the college and how it sparked other colleges to expand their intellectual property to generate revenue.

Plant variety protection orders, a few plant patents, and we have other patents that our faculty have developed, so some are biochemical and probiotics, some are engineering creations for planters and that kind of thing, but anyway we still generate more royalty revenue than any other college. I think our engineering college is one that historically has not been that active in research and generating IP – that’s changed dramatically. The dean really has been a force in changing the nature and reputation of that college. I think over time, I expect that college will overtake us in generating royalties from intellectual property but they’re not there yet.

Throughout this study, academic managers highlighted and championed entrepreneurialism impacting their institutions. They provided substantial evidence for the rise in the importance of revenue generation and resource allocation. The evidence provided further substantiates that the reduced share of state funding for higher education has shifted the academic managers' role. The shift impacts academic managers' conceptual framework from a time when the majority of their responsibility was managing the learning environment to managing a non-profit corporation. Academic managers engage in fundraising disguised as access and success (increased enrollment). They leverage external funds disguised as expanded partnerships (exploit and secure research funding). They perpetuate funding inequities among the academy, and they nurture faculty’s role of engaging in the solicitation of self-sustaining external funds.

Although this new environment may bolster funding for higher education, some consequences and challenges surface. When resources become limited, human nature’s instinct is to compete. Such is academia's case in this new environment.

Theme Two: Increased Competitiveness

Academic managers are required to engage in a highly competitive environment to grow and increase institutional funding. Participants in this study shared how their role as academic managers was to increase institutional prestige and rankings. Academic managers are concurrently charged with increasing enrollment to secure institutional funding while

diversifying their student body, being more selective in the admissions process, increasing rankings and institutional exposure, hiring prestigious faculty, and increasing graduation rates.

In response to a direct question regarding prestige, participant 5 responded by sharing:

So, unfortunately, it's more about the rankings and competition than it is about capitalism, and this is how we really make money. We're going to get more students to make money because we're ranked better. The rankings depend on the research. Really, very few, as I said, get rich off it. But the higher your rankings, the more students you get, the more you can charge them more. That's where you get your money.

Participant 2 also indicated how rankings and global competition directly impact their work:

I have to make a trip to Beijing every year. I don't like Beijing. It's a fascinating place, but I'm just not comfortable there. So, it's competitive... we are competing on a bigger stage than we were 50 years ago. Now it's not the national rankings that matter, it's the global rankings that matter, and so it's difficult to compete against the larger number of universities we deal with globally.

When I asked Participant 4 how colleges compete for the prestige they responded by stating, "ranking of their colleges, to a large degree." They further compared rankings to a beauty pageant, "Yeah, it's a beauty pageant, and we're competing in a beauty pageant, and if you're not blessed with really good looks, you better go to dean conferences and be Miss Congeniality or Mr. Congeniality." Participant 4's implication is that rankings depend on relationships and questionnaires. Participant 1 shared that prestige comes from "the students and the faculty and then our ability to tell that story."

Prestige is measured differently at different institutions. Each participant cited various measurements their institutions use to quantify "prestige." There was one consistent theme that emerged from the participants, and that was the use of metrics. Most of the participants discussed how metrics played a role in their management of academics. For instance, participant 3 responded to a question by sharing:

Because we've had a history of, um, engineers as our provosts, they send us metrics. And so, the way that you can get musicians, engineers, educators, and social workers to speak

in a language we all understand is about those metrics. If you want to talk back to academic affairs, understand the metrics. The metrics that matter here are probably the metrics that matter everywhere. So, we look at student credit hours, student-to-teacher ratios, research productivity, and publications. They're the classic kind of indicators that we all care about. Development dollars. So, those are the metrics. That's the things that based on where you, where your college is, um, in the scope of the university, that's how you can build prestige.

The measurement of prestige is certainly calculated differently at various institutions, but many participants indicated how competition impacted their admissions practices in striving for greater prominence. Participant 3 followed up the above statement describing how the *US News and World Report* affects their institution's admissions business processes and rankings:

US News and World Report's ranks a lot of your prestige on how many students you turn away. And he (president at that institution) would argue, 'no, no, no, no, no; we want to take students and, um, basically give deserving students opportunities and work with students. So, the fact that we graduate more, and in particular students that weren't as well-prepared and came from diverse backgrounds, we should be recognized for taking students that places like Virginia wouldn't take, and actually they've become successful.

Participant 4 provided additional details regarding how competition impacts their student's admission decisions:

You need bigger and better and nicer, more luxurious dorms. You got a lot more emphasis on Student Life. Athletics are a big draw for students. So, the investment you put into your football coach is going to pay huge benefits for your university. Because you appear in the final four your number of applications are going to go up. So, athletics is the front porch of many universities and you've got to make sure that that front porch is working really well.

Participant 1 shared their thoughts on how the admissions process is becoming more competitive. They shared the impacts of the cost of attendance and the growing interest in community colleges as options for students:

So, I don't know how many times people have told me what the tuition was when they went to school versus what it is now. It's revealing in the sense that, they're looking at the cost that's out of pocket for them to send their kid here and then saying, 'what are you

doing to keep your cost contained so that it remains as inexpensive as you can possibly make it.' I've never had somebody tell me, 'give my kid a mediocre education.' They demand a great education on as little money as possible, which is an interesting model when you think about it.

Participant 1 continued by sharing:

...the reason you (anyone) went to a community college wasn't primarily a cost-driven decision. It was geography, placement – being place-bound, the desire to stay at home, all kinds of factors. But now the role that community colleges are playing, I think, is increasingly a solution to the high cost of education. What we've tried here are to take steps to try to make sure that the transfer from the community colleges to here is more seamless and easy. And then also to build our whole admissions process on the basis that a large percentage of our students may start at a community college, and we want to encourage that actually.

What is interesting is the comments that participant 1 shared in that statement about parents demanding “a great education on as little money as possible”. If society, specifically parents in the instance above, knew how higher education was funded they might have a different mindset about neo-liberal philosophies, at least as it relates to funding higher education. Providing more higher education funding from the state would have a direct impact on reducing the cost of higher education for their students.

Participant 5 talked about how athletics didn't really impact their institution's admissions funnel; however, their board of regent continued to press on the importance that athletics has on prospective students:

My board of regents and alumni think when we have a good football team, we can recruit students better, and no amount of data that proves it wrong will make them believe that really investing in football, I'm sure at a certain point for a certain institution (not ours) is a good thing, but we're long past that here. And if anything, we just get the same trend line on the number of applications we're getting in. We get weaker applications when our football team has gotten a lot of notoriety, not better applications. I always would throw it to them, 'so you know how good MIT's football team is?' Because they have a really good incoming class and they were like, 'do they even have a football team?' Yeah, they do, the Beavers. They just let anybody who wants to play and they're not well known.

The participants provided evidence that higher education institutions are challenged more with competitiveness in admissions than ever before. They feel the expectation of competing in the *US News and World Report* rankings by completing surveys, being more selective in admissions, and building relationships with colleagues. All the while, they need to have new and excellent amenities and grand athletic departments to increase awareness and interest from prospects. Meanwhile, the costs associated with modernizing amenities, facilities, and athletic endeavors directly impact tuition and fees. The consumers (students and families) are concerned about the rising cost of higher education and are considering other options. Increased enrollment at the community college also impacts student options, and so these institutions must compete for first-year students and transfer students alike.

Pressure for Rankings and Exposure

Institutions also have to compete and chase national rankings to increase enrollment, external research funding, and public notoriety. Participant 5 shared that they had a friend who was in an assessment position at a different university. The friend shared a quote that guided them in their leadership as academic managers. The friend's quote was, "...if people would just learn you don't have to be bad to get better then we could do great things... the game was not, are you good? But we want to be better than just good." This quote provides context to higher education institutions' culture, and they expect to assess and improve despite meeting their purpose and mission. This environment perpetrates a constant "striving" culture where academic managers need to improve consistently, and the majority of improvement is quantified in rankings, funding dollars, and exposure.

I asked each of the participants how institutions compete for prestige. One of the most enlightening responses came from participant 5. His response was simply "sometimes stupidly."

They went on to describe a metric presented to them as an academic manager and the challenge that they faced in deciding rankings and the implications on their institution's prestige:

You know one time somebody did [some] analysis and came to me and said we can put a million dollars in this and it will make this weak thing in our rankings improve and we probably will go up at least two to five points and I was like and how will that million dollars help the students? And we were going to invest a million dollars to take our physical education classes from 20 or 21 students to 19. Because the cutoff for small classes is less than 20 and so we're going to invest... in you know, the quality of the instruction for 20 students is not different than for 19. Why don't we just give that million dollars to you know, a bunch of students? I just couldn't do it, but people are doing that analysis for academic leaders to tell them all these ways.

Participant 3 also shared that at their institution, rankings are highly considered and have an immediate impact on class size considerations when they manage:

The School of Kinesiology's athletic administration program is an 83-to-1 student ratio. You and I both know that you're not sending your kid to XXX (institution) to study with 83 of his best friends in a freshman composition course. That's not what you're looking for. So, I'm very clear, and I think that (rankings) impacts every decision that we make.

Besides managing external rankings, academic managers also have to compete among equivalent higher education and internal departments. Participant 5 coined the phrase, "prestige amongst academicians." They described this additional type of prestige as

...sending things to your peers about people we've hired, our programs we've started that we would never put in the newspaper. I think we think more about you should think if you're another institution, that we're the kind of place top scholars want to come be at to study or to work and we have slightly different take on that when we're talking about how we're going to market to parents or 18-year olds.

Throughout the study, multiple academic managers referenced metrics and utilized them to measure accountability and prestige. These metrics ranged from a variety of industry standards to institutional expectations. Participant 5 shared their reason for creating metrics for evaluation of academic managers within their institution:

I had metrics that included student, faculty, and staff diversity and included teaching and retention and graduation rates, and it recorded dollars and efficiencies and stuff like that, and it included research... I would put out all of these metrics (to the campus).

Participant 1 also referenced the use of metrics to evaluate prestige and how they were apparent to all academic managers on their campus.

Because we've had a history of, um, engineers as our provosts, they send us metrics. And so, the way that you can get musicians, engineers, educators, and social workers to speak in a language we all understand is about those metrics. The metrics that matter here are probably the metrics that matter everywhere. So, we look at student credit hours, student-to-teacher ratios, research productivity, and publications. They're the classic kind of indicators that we all care about. Development dollars. So those are the metrics. That's the thing that based on where your college is in the scope of the University. That's how you can build prestige.

Striving to Recruit Prestigious Faculty

Participants also indicated that they compete for prestige by attracting highly qualified faculty, offering competitive startup research packages and providing graduate student lines to help persuade faculty to come to their institution. Participant 1 shared how it's the responsibility of the administration to support faculty. Faculty don't care where monetary support comes from, as long as it was there to help them complete their research:

I think that the faculty are rather indifferent to where that support comes from, and so if it comes from higher tuition, that's fine. If it comes from cuts that are made in central administration, that's fine. If it comes from getting more efficient in doing something in central administration that doesn't affect them, that becomes fine.

The expectations that faculty have of being supported for their work is that I got lots of important work to do, and it's your job to support me. I think that that attitude still exists. I don't think it's a bad thing for that attitude to exist. When we bring a faculty member here, they should expect that we're going to support the work that they do, and we're not bringing them here to say, okay, you're on your own, you find your own funding for everything you want to do. That's not the way it works.

Participant 1 shares his philosophy regarding institutional support and its impact on faculty and research funding. He concludes by stating that, "That's not the way it works." But for so many faculty in the academy that is exactly how it works. There are funding and support inequities across disciplines, institutions, and regions. Institutions and academic managers hire

and recruit faculty with the expectation that they may indeed provide initial start-up research support. The unwritten long-term plan is that faculty become self-sufficient in providing funding for research, facilities, and graduate assistantships. Participant 2 provides some additional information and context which directly contradicts Participant 1's philosophy.

Participant 2 shared that prospective faculty interviewing at their university need to be asking very strategic questions during the hiring and onboarding process if they want to be successful as a prestigious faculty member:

...if they're not asking questions during the interview process about what kind of startup package will I have? Where will my laboratory be? What other resources will I have? Or, can you help me with a graduate assistantship for the first three years? Those are the kinds of questions. If they're not asking us those questions, they aren't going to be successful.

The type of faculty that these institutions are looking for are not teaching experts who can produce mid-level research. These institutions are striving, and they expect prospective faculty to be highly qualified, and they believe they can determine that upon entry by the questions they ask or don't ask. Participant 2 also shared what is included in the onboarding process of faculty:

Yeah so, well, the offer letter will include a startup package -right-of support that they will have at the outset. And so, it may include some funds for equipment. We may go ahead and make some renovations in the lab that they're going to move into before they get here. Um um often will provide funding for graduate assistantship for three years. Um-if they are on a 9-month appointment, we say: we'll provide two months of summer salary over your first three years. So, it doesn't get them every year, but-or maybe we do for the first three, but the second three, we'll give it two over those three years. So, the expectation is you need to be bringing in your own summer salary from grants, and you know, we'll carry you for the first two or three years, and then we're going to wean you off that because you should be bringing it in yourself. So-you know yeah, so we use those kinds of things in startup letters and in an offer letter. We involve the department head in that conversation, they're the ones doing the direct negotiations, and then they come back to us for, well they asked for this what can we offer? And so, you know, typically our answer well, what are you offering from the department um and then well here's what we'll offer from the college or the division.

Participant 2 contradicts participant 1's initial statement which indicated that there is no expectation for faculty to come here and be on their own. Participant 2 clearly states, "So, the expectation is you need to be bringing in your own summer salary from grants, and you know, we'll carry you for the first two or three years, and then we're going to wean you off that because you should be bringing it in yourself" (Participant 2).

In interviewing the participants, it was interesting to see that the one non-research one institution had a different perspective about their hired faculty. Participant 4 shared:

We try to hire people that are excellent researchers. They're capable of doing enough refereed research like three articles every five years. And if they say scholarly academic, then they get the three accredited, so our bar is just to keep everybody in good enough shape, research-wise, to stay scholarly academic. However, you know, we're not interested in being a top 25 research school that's producing research that looks real prestigious and doesn't create a lot of social value.

Institutions also compete for prestige by recruiting and hiring faculty from other prestigious institutions. Participant 5 discussed how their institution would invest large amounts of money in recruiting faculty, "we recruited them away from this school, and that's a big deal. But we did invest a lot of money, and sometimes we'd get them." They went on to discuss what factors went into consideration with the recruitment of faculty:

I think we go on particular hiring sprees for faculty. Sprees, that we knew were going to bring us prestige. So, you know it might be a chemist who has generated a lot of dollars and a lot of parents and stuff like that, but it might also be a sociologist who has some but is more well-known. So we would do target senior hires.

Participant 5 continued and gave explicit details about the process for hiring prestigious senior faculty:

It also made it hard for as belts got tighter and tighter to be very strategic in how we invested. Any I will tell you we did those strategic investments more and more in common by talking to all of the deans and all of this and letting them all talk to each other and me and others as to what investment made the most sense, you know, so I remember one time I would say, okay, we're going to have this many millions in new dollars. What is the most important thing for us to invest in... faculty and staff raises?

And/or... we would come up with a list and then we would have an all-day retreat and argue about what are and why are these the most important investments and do more common investments than just distributing it out like that. So, we might say okay, we're going to set aside to hire 25 faculty at \$225,000.00 a year. That's pretty high salary for a faculty. And here's a rule, no college can get more than two (hires). Okay, but we're also going to be first-come, first-serve, and you get the money when you land them here.

The participants provided evidence that one of the strategies that institutions utilize within this highly competitive environment is their determination to recruit and hire prestigious faculty. Whether the faculty are new or are being recruited from another institution, academic managers are committed to engaging in a competition for highly qualified candidates to elevate their institution's prestige. The tactics they utilize vary from institution to institution. Still, the evidence suggests that academic managers are strategic in leveraging them and understand the implications of employing highly qualified faculty who produce research, secure external funds, and add publicity to their prestige.

Theme Three: Increased Accountability from External Constituencies

As stated in the literature review, Marilyn Strathern's book *Audit Culture: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy* provides a detailed description of why institutions increase accountability. Authors Cris Shore and Susan Wright wrote a chapter titled *Coercive accountability: The rise of audit culture in higher education* and highlight new managerialism methods implemented by boards of regents. These boards looked to justify funding from neo-liberal state legislatures and help infuse a corporatization framework as they are typically industry or corporate managers. Shore and Wright provide evidence that supports academic managers are ensuring that faculty are productive and that there are efficient and accountable practices to measure productivity. Perhaps the authors' most important takeaway is the notion of professionals' identity they indicate evolved. Shore and Wright share that, "A key aspect of this process has been its effect in changing the identity of professionals and the way

they conceptualize themselves. The audited subject (professional) is recast as a depersonalized unit of economic resource whose productivity and performance must constantly be measured and enhanced.”

Lincoln (2011) published an article titled, “*A well-regulated faculty...’*”: *The coerciveness of accountability and other measures that abridge faculties’ right to teach and research*” which outlined exactly how increased accountability from state legislatures has impacted faculty and the academy. Lincoln (2011) addressed the implications of increased accountability from legislative regulations and the impact on teaching, faculty rights, and time dedicated to thinking, research, and public service. In 1977, the state of Texas adopted Section 51.402. of the Education Code which specifically required Texas colleges and universities to enact “general policies and standard reports for academic faculty workloads and services”. She explains how faculty are required, by the state to complete “forms” to document academic faculty workload. These forms are utilized to evaluate and provide formal feedback to faculty (Lincoln, 2011). The Texas Education Code (appendix) clearly states that the purpose of this regulation is to, “monitor workloads, prepare and review appropriate workload reports, and submit the reports to the institutional head for his certification or approval and comments as may be appropriate” (Tex. Edu. Code, Sec. 51.402).

Another Texas legislative bill requires faculty to post their syllabi online prior to the start of class (Lincoln, 2011). Representative Kolkhorst, sponsoring state legislator, also detailed how faculty should provide “a general outline of each lecture” so that students could “see what will be required of you before you aimlessly walk-in” to class (Kolkhorst Defends Bill, 2010). Lincoln (2011) explains how the law is short-sighted and rooted in ignorance. The bill “takes no account of majors sufficiently packed with state licensing requirements that students frequently have no

choice in whether or not they must take a course” (Lincoln, 2011, p.370). In addition, faculty rights, experience, education, and freedom are challenged as the bill “gives” students the right to evaluate course content prior to engagement. As Lincoln (2011) puts it, “The bill assumes that students are fully capable of making judgments regarding all the matters that go into course design, textbook choice, and sequencing of material” (pg. 370).

Lincoln (2011) also provided insight into how accrediting bodies have increased accountability and data requirements. She explains how her institution uses an online accountability tool where they are required to provide data and reports on “program area, program goals, learning objectives, anticipated learning outcomes, the extent to which learning outcomes are achieved, and steps to be taken to address failure to achieve a high percentage of learning outcomes” (Lincoln, 2011, pg. 370). The increased accountability not only comes from state legislators and accrediting bodies, but it has also come directly from the Board of Regents. Lincoln (2011) explains how promotion and tenure dossiers came off of her institution’s Board of Regent’s consent agenda. Moving the promotion and tenure decisions from the consent agenda to the regular meeting agenda implies that the Board of Regent members are no longer entrusting faculty and administration to make the recommendation and allow it to be formalized by the board. Rather, as Lincoln (2011) explains, “To take dossiers off the consent agenda is to signal that the Board, rather than the faculty, will make the final decisions on who is promoted and tenured” pg. (370).

Academic managers have not only had to adhere to but enact several of these legislative-directed “accountability” measures to manage faculty and staff production, evaluation, and promotion. Marc Spooner (2017) put it best when he indicated that, “Through its coercive properties, the audit culture renders us as auditable subjects, compelling us to conform to its own

(ideological) notions of what counts as scholarship, and especially to what can be easily quantified, tabulated, and standardized for the purposes of comparable benchmarking.” (pg. 905).

The word “accountability” came up many times throughout interviews with various academic managers. In the evaluation of the data, it was evident that although academic managers directly mentioned accountability many times, there were just as many instances where academic managers used coded language to infer accountability. As the investigator, I specifically asked four questions that prompted the academic manager’s thoughts and experiences with accountability within the academy. The four questions that sparked academic managers' responses regarding accountability were: 1) To what do you attribute an increase in accountability within higher education? 2) How has the incorporation of market-like activities impacted higher education? 3) Since faculty work-life has been redefined because of academic capitalism, how do academic managers work with their faculty? Do academic managers believe that there is a compression of space and time within academia? and 4) What do academic managers think about the heightened audit culture within higher education, and how do they manage their faculty/environments? I intended to understand why academic managers believe accountability increases and conclude what impact it might have on higher education.

What I discovered was that there is indeed more accountability in higher education today than ever before. Academic managers cite legislative pressure as the primary influencer demanding greater accountability despite state funding reduction for higher education. Academic managers did not show a profound perspective of a futuristic vision with increasing responsibility and the long-term implications of implementing and perpetrating “accountability” influenced by outside entities among the institution's faculty and every function.

I concluded that influence for greater accountability comes from three groups: state and federal legislatures, boards of regents, and parents. Each group has its reasons and perspectives on responsibility. Still, all seem to stem from a shift in societal perspective on the role of government, the cost of education, and the debate of knowledge being a public good versus a private good. Participant 5 responded to the question about audit culture and increased accountability by stating, “Well, I think it’s good, and anything can be taken to an extreme.” Participant 3 indicated that “part of what that audit [culture] does, is it gets you to see how you match up with the broader community and take account of the work that you’re doing.” Participant 2 shared their perspective on accountability and the audit culture,

...it’s just a sense of greater, a need for greater accountability in government in general, and in business on the private sector, you got to be accountable. You got to be able to show what value you brought to the organization or you’re not going to be employed. Kind of the extreme of that is the Koch Brother’s approach and where, as I understand it, if you worked there, you had to be able to articulate what your value was to the organization was at any point in time. And the more quantitatively you could do that, the better your case was. So, you know it goes along with the corporations being accountable, and if you’re the CEO or you’re the CFO of whatever, you got to be able to demonstrate to your directors and your shareholders what value you’re bringing. What differences you’re making. How you’re enhancing the value of their investments – and really, that, that sort of private sector capitalist outlook has had an influence on us in the public sector as well. Not just in education, but in government agencies. I think it’s a good thing. I mean, **I like being accountable**. I like being able to say, yes, we’ve been given 42 million dollars by the state of XXX, and here’s how it’s changed people’s lives. Any data I can get that tells that story, quantitatively, I soak it up.

Academic managers provided evidence that they supported and adapted to a heightened audit culture disguised as “accountability.” They indicated that they collectively believe that accountability is a good thing by somehow justifying their actions, reacting to external pressure, and disrupting the long-standing tradition of collegiality amongst higher education professionals. As I stated in the opening of the accountability section, there was no mention of the long-term implications for higher education as we continue to operate under this pretense. What is evident

is that there has been and will continue to be a shift in how academic managers lead higher education institutions.

Legislative Pressure Applied to Higher Education

During an interview with one participant they provided a great perspective on higher education as it relates to efficiency:

I like to quote [President Name] when he was president here. He hired a vice president for administration, vice president for finance, essentially and she was frustrated because there was another concept being talked about. He said to me, I was doing faculties at the time, take it to the faculty and have this discussion and she threw up her hands and said, why are we discussing this? We know it's the right answer and this is so inefficient to have another discussion and he smiled at her and said your job is to be efficient. The academic's job is to be effective and sometimes being effective is not efficient. He says for example, if I wanted to teach history, by the way, he had a Ph.D. in history the most efficient way, I'd fill up [football stadium name] with thousands of students and broadcast on a big screen a lecture and that might be efficient but it's not effective. So, always remember your job with the finance part is to look for efficiencies, but that things that touch on academics we think about it not just in terms of efficiencies or the money, but are we being effective at our mission? So, I thought it was interesting he felt the need to, and he was from the CIA and stuff, but he felt the need to explain this to this person. I don't think you understand the culture of higher ed and not every division is primarily after efficiencies and that our main business of being educationally effective it's not going to be measured by how efficient we are (Participant 5).

Participants verified that there is pressure from state and federal legislatures who strive to ensure public funds are utilized and expended in an “efficient” manner. Academic managers cited how a portion of their role and responsibility is to interact with state legislatures to defend higher education and lobby for additional funding. Finally, they shared how legislative funding metrics are not unilaterally beneficial for all institutions.

Participant 1 responded to the question with this comprehensive explanation:

...going back to who pays for the education – and I use this example, and I think about it – in the year 1999/2000, just 18 years ago, if you looked at how our budget was constructed, 70 percent of our budget came from the state and 30 percent came from tuition. So, now that's completely flipped, where 75, almost 80 percent, I'd say 80 percent now from tuition, and 20 percent comes from the state. So, when you think about it... first of all, state legislatures should never be saying anything to us. They ought to be

sitting on the sideline because they don't fund us anymore. They support us a bit, but they don't fund us...

Participant 1 shared additional information about legislative pressure regarding accountability

Now, the mystery to me is we've also seen an increase in accountability on the legislature side, particularly the state legislatures, and I ascribe this to the fact that even though they only fund 20 percent of what we do, or the cost of us, for us it's about 122 million dollars a year, they think relative to what they fund other state agencies that's a lot of money. I think that they want us to be accountable for those dollars, which is not as large as a piece as our entire budget, but nonetheless that's a huge chunk of state support annually that they're providing. In that respect we're no different than the DMV, than the highway department, than prisons, etc.

There are multiple forms of accountability. One comes when legislatures explicitly communicate with academic managers about efficiencies and expectations from legislatures while others are indirect. Participant 5 shared how state legislatures pressure higher education institutions with funding metrics that use data and how these metrics can be unfair to various institutions:

So, in our state, they tried to say okay, you'll get some performance measure on how good you're doing but some on how much you're improving, and then they had argument after argument about how to weight that because you and us were doing pretty good on all kinds of metrics. So, we'd get all the money if you measured it on how many degrees in the what area and stuff like that, but then we didn't have many remedial students, you know, our diversity wasn't as good as it should be. So, there were some we didn't do good on, but then if you measured it mostly on improvement... well, if you already have an 85% graduation rate versus somebody who has a 29% graduation rate, they have a lot more room to improve five percent than we do.

Participant 2 shared how a large part of their role as a university administrator was to communicate with state legislatures and lobby for the university in hopes of impacting future budget allocations:

...our legislature is only in session from February through May unless there's an emergency and the governor calls them back into session, which she did last year but not this year. So, during those months, February through May, I'm in Oklahoma City on a regular basis meeting with legislators. I had an assistant VP that worked with me up until a year ago now. He retired, and I decided with budget cuts that I couldn't justify hiring another one when we're leaving faculty positions vacant. But still, my communications

with legislatures has been: this is what we do, this is what the state money does and allows us to do and this is what we're not able to do because of the reductions, and so, I'm very direct with them that the budget cuts are harmful and that they reduce our ability to perform our mission. I've also said, look, I know there are things we can do to be more efficient, and so we're working on making those adjustments.

The accountability pressure from legislatures toward faculty is explained by participant 1:

Now, the state legislatures, on the other hand, I think part of their accountability issues is on the efficiencies of how faculty teach, whether or not we need to do research – not only here in XXX, but other places question why we have a research mission at all – why we have a research mission at all – why don't you just teach students, it would be cheaper than to build laboratories and that sort of thing. So, that accountability is a different issue. I'll hear from them weighing in on behalf of the parents regarding the costs. In fact, some of our legislatures, here and in other states I've been in, really believe in this private good notion. And really firmly believe that the whole cost ought to be on the parents and their students, after all, you're getting a lot of good out of this, and so it's like buying a car. Going from paying for a car, why are you balking about paying for your kids' education... that's sort of the perspective that I've heard some legislatures have. So, their accountability for faculty is in workload issues, a lot of social activism issues, particularly in a conservative mode, free speech issues recently. Some of them are engaged in, and all of those are holding the faculty accountable, but not from a financial perspective, in an efficiency perspective as much as the involvement that they have in education process itself.

As participant 1 shares, there are some state legislators who really focused on faculty and the academy because of political and ideology differences. “Lawmakers, mainly Republicans, from states all over the country have subsequently intervened in matters of free speech in academe by proposing and helping to pass legislation that makes clear students can't interfere with the speech of their peers or of visitors on campus” (Bauer-Wolf, 2019, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/09/16/states-passing-laws-protect-college-students-free-speech>). Conservative legislators see higher education as a private good and also recognize that they can drum up support among their constituents by casting faculty and the academy as liberal elites who need to be held accountable. That accountability ranges from faculty workloads to concern that higher education promotes political ideologies counter to conservative values.

Participant 1 also shared how the humanities have been impacted disproportionately by legislative pressure.

I'd say the humanities have been beat up in the last five- to ten years, or maybe even longer than that, about who needs humanities research. That is a group that has been beat up, I think, because of a lack of understanding of what a modern research university does. So, I don't think those are academic managers that are going to the Philosophy Department saying, "what have you done for me recently?" I think that comes from the outside. That kind of pressure comes from legislatures, others from the outside that don't see the value of basic scholarship that's done across the board in all of our areas.

The evidence collected from this study shows a correlation between how state legislatures are applying pressure to higher education, and the impact it has had on institutions and academic managers. Collectively, we are able to see how state legislators have reduced funding for higher education, how they have set up a capitalist framework for funding that is dependent upon enrollment and credit-hour generation, and how they directly engage with academic managers to apply legislative pressure for greater accountability. This conundrum provides some thought-provoking questions: How much less can the state reduce funding for higher education while demanding greater accountability? How will future academic managers lead in a new environment that requires their primary focus to defend the institution's operational enterprise and function concurrently while serving multiple constituents, including faculty, staff, and students? How does higher education meet all constituents' needs when all constituent groups have unrealistic expectations derived from their isolated perspectives? This is a perennial problem that will impact higher education and academic managers for the foreseeable future.

Parental and Societal Expectations of Higher Education

Multiple constituent groups have a vested interest in higher education. Parents of prospective and current college students are one of the most important constituent groups. Seemingly, parents have a strong influence on their student's college choice, and often many of

them help fund the cost and play a vital role in the student's transition from home to college. Participants in this study did share how parents apply pressure for accountability. I must note, participants did not indicate that parental influence was as significant as a legislative influence; however, they did make the observation that parents communicate with their state legislators and reference the cost of higher education, which is indirect pressure.

One of the recurring topics that surfaced from academic managers regarding parents was the cost of higher education and a lack of understanding of why the cost of higher education has increased since the parents were last in college. The notion of higher education institutions single-handedly increasing the cost of college provides excellent insight into how society does not understand the funding model of higher education and how states have reduced funding, requiring institutions to raise tuition. Therefore, this leads to a call for greater accountability from parents who see a drastic rise in attendance cost when they compare the time when they were in college to now not understanding society's shift in funding an initiative considered a public good.

When I pressed participant 1 for further explanation about how parents apply pressure for accountability, they shared the following

I think the biggest one for the students and their parents is the cost piece of it. So, that almost drives all of the accountability issues, nothing more than that really. So, I'm paying a lot for this education, relative to when I went to school. So, I don't know how many times people have told me what the tuition was when they went to school versus what it is now. It's revealing in the sense that they're looking at the cost that's out of pocket for them to send their kid here and then saying, what are you doing to keep your cost contained so that it remains as inexpensive as you can possibly make it?

Participant 1 continued to share how parental expectations play into the accountability culture:

I think parents and students, in particular, who pay now much more relative to other things that they pay for have every right to demand our accountability. It's an accountability of how are we doing our job to keep the education affordable as we can

and delivering a quality education that we say we are. That's a big piece of the accountability.

Parents are a part of greater society; therefore, we can imagine that if parents of college students do not understand the ecosystem of higher education funding and the shift that has occurred over the last thirty-plus years, then we can agree that a large part of our society does not understand it as well. In trying to understand why accountability pressure has seemingly increased within the last decade or so, participants help me understand this phenomenon by sharing how neoliberal politics have impacted society and have filtered into higher education.

Participant 2 responded by sharing,

...changes in society have influenced that, I guess just a more greater sense of a need for accountability. I'm not doing very well with that, but it's the same with welfare programs. You know, at first, it was sort of, well here let's put more money into this and people will be better fed or have they will have healthier lives. Then there was sort of a sense of wait a second, what are they doing for that so there's this, I guess trend of, conservative political trend towards expecting more, greater accountability really across society. Anything that is being done with public funds should be more accountable. I think universities, in some respects, are a healthy part of it. It's really come on down out of the ivory tower, you really ought to be able to explain to someone in the world why what you're doing is important... and so there's a little bit of that. I think there's also been, you know, more political notion that faculty, not only don't feel accountable to anyone, that they can do what they darn well please, but they tend to be too liberal compared with the political norms of the day. There's a sense of, ah hah, faculty have a sense of privilege, that it's their birthright, and the public – who's paying for that birthright – are saying wait a second, you have to earn that. You have to demonstrate why what you're doing merits a public investment.

Participant 1 explained how and why funds are limited, and the neoliberal state within politics.

There's this demand on how are you using those monies that we gave you because those dollars are precious and without getting too political, this is in part due to a shift over the years, I think in the role of government and the role that government is perceived to play in society in general. It's no secret that since the Reagan years, there's been more of a push to decrease taxes than increase taxes or even keep your taxes the same. Whenever you cut taxes, you've got to cut allocation or keep it the same, and that's how you see the shift of who's paying for education over the years. I think that in spite of that happening, there's still this issue of we know we're giving you less, but we're demanding that you

account for every dollar that you spend and also that the product that you are delivering, the education that comes out of here, is of the highest quality. So those things go hand in hand. It's kind of a paradox that this even goes on, given the relevant amount of support declining over the years from those that are trying to hold us most accountable.

In addition to calls for greater accountability from parents and the increased neoliberal philosophies, academic managers also indicated that society has evolved and that there is a lack of understanding from society on the university's role and its impact. Participant 3 shared how the community struggles to buy what universities are selling and provides insights into why they think.

I think they don't buy what we're selling 'cuz they don't know how much we do. So, like a prime example... I said this a couple of times, but I would argue that our current president is a master of telling the story. Telling the story of who we are and what we do.

Participant 3 shared that perhaps parents and society do not comprehend what a university's charge is. "I think to even think of us as simply a business and to be driven by a profit margin is reductionist and doesn't fully comprehend what we are charged with doing." Participant 5 told a story about their father, indicating universities' societal expectations and how higher education thrives in inefficiencies.

...the guys who grew up in the corporate world like my own father, they know how to play that game, and they understand aspects of higher ed, but they don't really understand... what they haven't thought deeply... they understand, but they haven't thought deeply about what it means to do a public good, and so you invest for returns. I mean, there's been lots of studies that say in the last two decades even philanthropists don't just give money to non-profits. They want to see a return on their money and stuff like that. So, they have this mindset that has taught them measure, be efficient, if it's not working, kill it, you know, and stuff like that. They bring that mindset to what they think are inefficiencies in higher ed. And there are inefficiencies in higher education.

In addition to society not buying what higher education is selling, participant 1 shared how their institution recognized that their institution isn't doing a good enough job of sharing their success stories and impacting higher education's societal perception.

So, we made a decision actually, that in what we wanted to emphasize moving forward is the public good as much as the private good and get away from the idea that the only reason you go to college is to better yourself. We've lost the concept of bettering society.

Higher education institutions are inefficient. External constituents, parents, and the greater society, are not aware of the evolution of higher education and universities' original missions to ensure societal good. "In economics, a public good is non-rivalrous and non-excludable, meaning one person's consumption of the good does not prevent or make it impossible for another person to consume it. A public good is also non-rejectable—once it is supplied, people cannot refuse it" (Cantor, pg. 50, 2020). Academic managers are aware that society has unreal expectations and that there has been a shift in appreciation of higher education as serving a public good.

Throughout the study, academic managers did not cite any long-term plans to remedy society's higher education perception collectively. It is evident that thus far, higher education has adapted to a culture that has evolved to incorporate a greater emphasis on neoliberalism. I dedicated a part of this study to determine what skillsets future academic managers will need to have to operate in this new environment. It leaves us with additional questions about academic managers and society's misunderstanding of higher education's purpose. What can academic managers do to alter the perception of society's view of higher education? Is it the role of academic managers to transform society's view of higher education? If not academic managers, whose role is it and when will it begin?

The Debate of Higher Education as Public Good Versus Private Good

Academic managers find themselves in a tricky situation as state funding decreases, rises, competition grows, accountability increases and society no longer views higher education as a

public good. Hensley, Galilee-Belfer, & Lee (2013, pg. 553) provide a historical context of how higher education was quantified as a public good.

One of the central issues Plato addresses in *The Republic* is the relationship between education and ‘the Good,’ with education serving as the mechanism through which public good – characterized by truth, beauty, virtue and justice – is advanced. The relationship between education and ‘the Good’ that Plato identified millennia ago is still recognized today, though much of the contemporary paradigm connects education with a narrower sense of good: the economic good of the individuals who benefit from learning, and the fiscal vitality of the communities in which those individuals are housed.

The “economic good” and the “fiscal vitality” are a part of the contemporary paradigm but this is a really narrow perspective when truth, beauty, virtue, and justice are pushed aside. Viewing education as a private good where the isolated goal of education is aligned to an economic value has created the current environment we’re in: an academic capitalist environment. Evaluating the success of a college degree exclusively on one’s ability to get a job and make money devalues learning and humanity. Graduating students should not only be able to live a better life economically, but they should be able to have experienced and encountered different people and perspectives that require them to critically think. They should have a basic understanding of history and its implications for the future. Students should have been exposed to art, music, the humanities, physical education, and an ability to explore learning for the sake of learning. Truth, beauty, virtue, and justice are the values that higher education affords in an effort to shape students’ character. These are equally, if not more, important than an economic return on educational investment. Academic managers know that higher education is a public good but have subverted these values in their everyday management of the academy.

Academic managers shared how they are challenged with operating higher education institutions with the intent of a public good outcome while serving under the management of neo-liberal legislatures and boards of regents who, in addition to a growing population of society,

believe that higher education is a private good. Participant 3 shared how it is difficult to live up to the standards of being a “good” public institution and executing capitalist managerial functions.

what good publics are supposed to do is to be servants of the state, and we’re serving the demographic of the state in ways that we never have before...
...the most expedient and cost-effective ways to go about educating a population isn’t the best as far as value. So, we’re constantly having to figure out how to walk the tightrope between how to relate to the market, how to be sustainable, but then at the same time recognizing that our primary goal isn’t to accumulate larger endowments and more resources. That’s not our primary goal.

Academic managers shared explicit examples of ways higher education institutions help local, state, and federal constituents by creating an informed citizenry and providing research that impacts their daily life and positive economic impacts on regional areas of their states.

Participant 2 shared how their college had an extension agency associated with their division.

After fires burned throughout the area, the institution provided several resources to help the local economy and provide basic education.

So, we had this year some pretty bad wildfires in northwestern XXX [state] in the spring, its actually the third year in a row we had fires, and we’ve learned from the first two years, and so we were ready, our communications group in particular, in extension, responded very quickly. So the fire blew on a Friday, and some of our communications folks went out there and started shooting video, getting stuff up, we went out, and we found old fact sheets and updated them. Information – all we could do to get information out to people who needed it, whether it was how to deal with dead livestock, or a failed crop, insurance, all those kinds of things. Over that course of a week, from that Friday morning to the next Friday morning, we had 1.3 million views on our website.

It’s not only basic education provided for the good of the public but also research and its impact on the greater society. Participant 3 shared how the public is unaware of how research and scholarship within higher education impact their daily lives.

Even if you were to take a place like the University of Florida where they created Gatorade. Even that connection between the University of Florida and Gatorade isn’t as clear. The average person’s like, ‘oh that’s a drink; a sports drink.’ You know, but whatever it means to create a popular drink like that, or to be the place that created a drug

to address cerebral palsy or something like that, there's just not a clear connection. They [the public] don't have a clue.

The greater society does not also understand the economic impact that higher education institutions have on the state and the local community. Higher education institutions are multimillion-dollar enterprises that spend resources in the local community, whether via purchasing consumables or hiring local community members to serve as faculty, staff, or administration. Participant 3 also shared how the city that they reside in has two universities within ten minutes of each other and the economic impact they have on that specific community.

...both XXX [institution one] and XXX [institution two] are both ten minutes away from each other. So, you have an HBCU system and the predominately white system here in XXX [city of institution], so when I say they bring 5.1 billion dollars in economic impact, even if you don't work at XXX [institution two] you get that the students that are here live in a community, spend money on fast food, on petroleum, or housing. But I don't think we've done a good job at telling them there's a value whether you go to XXX [institution two] or not. We're bringing something to it. We have terrible traffic here, and XXX [institution two] has been working extra to figure out what to do to ease traffic. We've don't a lot on coastal erosion. Ya'll know... ya'll have had the same problem with erosion and coastlines. We're one of the places that researches that. Not telling our story well enough and being so, like academics... so academic that you don't know what the hell it is unless you're in that area, that's why I think the public doesn't support us because they don't really know what we do and particularly what we do for the public, not just that we have a good football team.

As Boyer (1990) concluded in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate*,

American higher education has never been static. For more than 350 years, it has shaped its programs in response to the changing social context. And as we look at today's world, with its disturbingly complicated problems, higher learning, we conclude, must, once again, adapt. It would be foolhardy not to reaffirm the accomplishments of the past. Yet, even the best of our institutions must continuously evolve. And to sustain the vitality of higher education in our time, a new vision of scholarship is required, one dedicated not only to the renewal of the academy but, ultimately, to the renewal of society itself (pg. 81).

Boyer concluded that higher education needed to respond to the changing social context in 1990; academic managers cite a further departure from society valuing higher education as a public good. Perhaps the debate of higher education as a public good is dead; maybe we've lost the

battle. Academic managers have positively responded to the changing social context. They shared how they believe their function is to use data to prove to internal and external entities that higher education is a public good and that institutions are making a difference in the lives of those they serve.

How Accreditation and the Need for Data Impact an Audit Culture

In addition to legislative pressure and a societal shift in higher education perception, academic managers shared that higher education's accrediting standards also require data collection and assessment that add to the auditing and accountability framework. Although accrediting standards require institutions to collect data and improve based on that data, current academic managers have leveraged "data collection" as a tool, or a weapon – depending on your perspective, to audit and preserve accountability in extreme measures. Lincoln (2012) talked specifically about how her institution instituted online software for faculty, chairs, and department leaders to dump data, learning outcomes, and progress reports all in an effort to appease accrediting agencies.

All academic managers within the study referenced the importance of data and data collection. Interestingly, they boasted about the amounts of data they collected, analyzed, and used to make decisions. The implications and results of data collection impact those audited differently from those controlling the auditing process. As Shore and Wright (2000, pg. 73) explain, "The economy and efficiency of the audit process itself requires that the emphasis is on the 'control of control.'" The authors include a quote from a statement released by the Association of University Teachers in 1984 sharing their perspective, "critics argue that the imperatives for control that follow audit could 'undermine staff and institutional autonomy... and would have a debilitating effect on teaching and academic freedom'". It has also generated a

climate of fear that non-compliance with the managerial drive for normalization and standardization will be punished” (Shore & Roberts, 1997). Although academic managers didn’t share a perspective of how internal constituents feel about data collection, the climate it creates, and the culture for consistent improvement, academic managers agreed that they are deeply entrenched in pursuing accountability while leveraging data.

Participant 1 shared that they believed that the audit culture is even generational by sharing their perspective on how faculty of different generations react to the reduced space and time within the academy.

...that’s generational. If you ask a younger faculty member, I think they want to be assessed on the impact that they have across the board and make a case for themselves on what the impact is as a scholar, as a teacher, as a person who provides services for the state, etc. Older faculty members still want to say, ‘you know, I think we should still be able to look at the research that’s done and assess that scholarship and tenure people that tend to be high in that area. So, there’s a generational difference. Might come down to this point: how was I evaluated. I was evaluated this way, and so the rest of the world needs to be evaluated that way for every day, forever, and ever. I think there is a shift going on.

Participant 5 also shared how they believed that the faculty’s years of service in the academy correlated closely with their perception of how intrusive today’s audit culture can be.

So, you have faculty that just started, and this is the best job, and you have faculty who are finishing their career, and they still think it's the best job, but they're ticked that something isn't as easy I find that when you're talking here, I'm not talking about nationwide, but here to faculty, it's interesting to find out if they are unhappy, why they were unhappy. The more Senior Faculty have learned that managers come and go. And usually, even if you don't have tenure... you can wait them out, okay, the more Junior Faculty are less patient and want things to work, not all but some of them want things to work their way, you know, this would help them, and they're anxious about getting over hurdles of succeeding and sometimes moving on they don't want to be here but not that often. So it's when you put them all in the same bucket as if the same thing is driving them. I don't find that to be true. Thirty years ago, young Faculty were anxious. They’re starting their career, starting a family, anxious about a lot of things and how it's going to work out and how they make their mark on the world and how they make a difference and stuff like that. Faculty now are anxious about that. Senior Faculty when I joined 36 years ago, some of them had been hired into a predominantly undergraduate institution, and now they're at a research institution and four out of five of them were not happy and

thought it was a mistake, but the one out of five of them was like, you know... this one guy can think if he had joined our faculty in 1937. So when I came in 1983, he was talking to me, and he says, you know institutions change, it'll change around here year after year just trust and help them not lose themselves. He was a great mentor to me. I just kind of learned from him that pretending like the institution is always going to value me as the most important thing or do things the way we used to do it. I find that we reinvent things over and over again. We had it, did away with it, we reinvented it and said, whoa, aren't we glad we thought of this, and you're like just like the guys who did it 15 years ago thought of it, and we let it slip, and then we get it back. So, there seems to be common cycles. So I think society has accelerated too much. So I think the anxiousness that you're referring to as if it has happened uniquely to higher ed is not true. I think, you know, I read a futurist paper and predicting what our graduates would do at the end of their 30-year, 40-year career is like predicting in 1250 AD what people would be doing now. That's how much our society has accelerated changes in jobs and expectations and stuff like that. And we're doing it on purpose. We want everything to be faster. I think that's having a toll on all of society. So, it's not unique to higher ed. There is no way with society doing this for us to just say well, let's stop it. There is a way, again, going back to the public good, for us highlighting what this is doing to people in society. But if we focus what it's doing to everybody as if it's only happening to us, the space and time compression and stuff like that, nobody else will listen to us because we are just whining. We need to be talking more about this change that is happening on all of society including people who work for Academia. Not just us.

Participant 2 shared how their institution collected and analyzed data on faculty publications and research. They talked about how faculty can enter all of their work and credentials into software, and the institution can quantify their publications and research.

I mean, there are good information systems that we could be using. You know, Academic Analytics, ... where faculty can, rather than using the annual report on a bizarre form we get, they can just enter the data into a data system... there's a way for faculty they only have to put it in once, and you make it so that if they want they can push a button and get a CV printed out and in the meantime, you're collecting data on publication numbers.

Participant 5 talked about how they found an individual at the institution who could collect data and quantify institutional progress through data. When the academic manager became the provost, they expanded their role to ensure data were consistently captured.

So, by the time I came to be provost because I swim with all these people who knew the data then I put the data people under one guy, and he'd run financial aid for years, and financial aid has to do all kinds of reporting and stuff like that, and he had with his people developed some of the best, because you can't make a flaw in financial aid reporting. So, he was really good, and he got them to quit squabbling so much and put some really good

IT support behind the data people so that then they would come to me and I was like a challenge I would say, well if we could just know a little bit more like this or traces and they would figure out a way to do it or tell me with limits, this is what we could do and stuff like that. I usually didn't want it one time. I wanted to give them time to do it so that the report could be generated regularly. Then other colleges could use it, and so I say they love me jokingly because I always was wanting one more thing, but I was always patient that you know, got reports of what to turn in to the coordinating board and stuff like that. But my problems were interesting, so I got a response from them.

Although participant 5 talked about the importance of data, it was not all about data collection and data distribution. Participant 5 also spoke about how data-informed them and how they leveraged it to hold academics accountable.

So, we generated retention in the university and retention in program data for cohorts that were first-time freshmen, for masters students, for Ph.D. students, and for transfer students, not at the graduate level but at the undergraduate level. Time to degree was another metric that we used especially well, even for transfer students. I would use four-year and five-year graduation rates for transfer and so, you know, I would hold them accountable, where are they compared to the university or college average and are they getting better?

Data is not only used to hold academics accountable in the form of conversations and data distribution. Academic managers must defend their evaluations by quantifying the progress of their division. Participant 5 shared how they would use the data to provide a letter grade during other academic managers' evaluation processes.

So, I would let them tell me how to measure their units. You as a college know what are doing. They would tell me, and some of them were using professional organization rankings or certain metrics that you could see from rankings systems. They were telling me why this was important to them. We were saying how does this make you a more impactful entity? Because don't tell me we got more publications per faculty than the others. Why does that make you better? You know, tell me what you're looking at that says to you; therefore, we are better than we have been. Now if it's this metric along with three others and here's why we think those who that we're really prolific in this area. You know, it's tough. I actually would give each of their units a grade, each department.

It was evident that there are systems in place to collect data to meet the expectations of accrediting agencies as well as provide a consistent evaluation of programs, students, progress, and other academic managers. These data tell stories of what is happening but may not always

accurately portray why it is happening. Most of the data points referenced as being collected were quantitative and leveraged single-handedly without multiple constituents' consultation. Participant 4 perhaps said it best when they shared their thoughts on the reasons institutions collect data, “The accrediting body, it gives them one more reason to justify their existence. They may be a non-profit, but they’re making money. They want to keep them and their co-workers employed.”

Status of Higher Education

Colleges and universities are educational enterprises which were not only created to “prepare students for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to humane ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape a citizenry that can promote the public good” (Boyer, 1990, pg. 77). For years, higher education was managed as just that – an educational enterprise created to promote the public good. For a long time, chancellors, presidents, provosts, vice-presidents, and deans have ensured that instrumental academic foundations were maintained within the academy. Some of these foundations included maintaining academic rigor, managing research and scholarship, and ensuring that higher education remained a marketplace of ideas. Participant 5 shared how presidents used to be intellectual thought leaders, “I think what was good before ’44 - and I read some of the great papers written by various university presidents and great speeches given - is they were really the intellectual thought leaders of society or had come through the kind of gauntlet to be amongst the intellectual thought leaders.” This study suggests that the educational enterprise has shifted dramatically, and the roles and functions of academic managers are vastly different today than ever before.

The Management of Higher Education as a Nonprofit Corporation

Higher education is more entrenched with capitalism. It has singlehandedly transformed the academy and the professoriate, students, society, and state legislatures, requiring a redefinition of higher education. The new definition interprets higher education as a private good where entrepreneurialism, competition, and accountability are required, creating and needing a fresh perspective and unique academic managers' unique skillset. This new framework must be implemented to operate a modern university – a complex capitalistic enterprise.

Academic managers connect their role in higher education to leaders of nonprofit corporations. In contrast, they need to introduce and leverage new managerial techniques to ensure a maximum return on investment, productivity, efficiencies, and outcomes to multiple constituent groups. These techniques require them to identify, cultivate, and secure revenue and resources by increasing enrollment headcount and credit-hour generation, expanding external partnerships with an emphasis on money and maximizing competitiveness in the admissions process at their institution while increasing institutional rankings prestige. Academic managers believe the best way to do this is by attracting more students despite the possibility of saturating the market, lobbying legislators who have proven to be neo-liberal, collecting data on every aspect of the institution, along intrusive management of faculty and staff.

Nonprofit corporations are entities that serve some public purpose and have income tax exemptions. They are required to reinvest surplus revenue back into the organization. Higher education institutions are categorized as state entities; however, academic managers operate universities as if they are running nonprofit corporations. As I was researching this topic and interviewing the first academic manager, one question evolved during their interview conclusion. I found myself reviewing my field notes towards the end of the interview and realized that the

academic manager I was interviewing was describing a new higher education era. I was perplexed and followed up with a question about what a future academic manager might need to succeed in this modern era of academic capitalism. I then asked a specific question regarding what skillsets future academic managers need to be successful.

Skillsets Future Academic Manager Need to be Successful

In what follows, each participant provided detailed skills that they believed academic managers would need to lead future institutions. The themes that emerged from the data support that future leaders need skills that align more with corporate behaviors rather than traditional academic approaches. Participant 1 shared that they believed that future academic managers would need strong skills in change management, strategic planning, and collaboration.

...we talk to our students about probably the best thing you're going to learn while you're in college is how are you going to deal with uncertainty in the future and how are you going to deal with a lifetime of change that's going to happen because we can't predict what's going to happen technologically in society. I think nobody would have predicted the politics we're seeing right now even two years ago. I think for academic managers, I'm less concerned about them getting skills in budget processing and all of the ins and outs of being whatever position they're in and more about how do you deal with change, how do you promote change, how do you help others in an era that is unpredictable and certainly would be changed. It's one of those kinds of intangible skills that are absolutely necessary.

Participant 2 shared explicit skill sets of what they believed future academic managers need to succeed in this new era of higher education.

...the skills you really need to work on are these skills: articulating, identifying a vision, developing a vision with your colleagues, articulating it to them, having them agree and endorse it, and to buy into it by their behavior not just with what they say. Being able to communicate that to external audiences, having it be compelling enough that it gets investments from the dean or from the provost or from a funding agency or a legislature. Um so, ultimately that's what you got to be able to deliver on to be a successful academic leader. You've got to be able to define, articulate, and advance vision for what you're about.

Participant 3 shared how it was important for future academic managers to have robust data analytics and market analysis skills and be flexible.

I tell you what, my former boss... the thing that I'm drawn from... I mean, I'm blown away with his ability to know the data, know the trends, understand the markets; it blows me away.

They continued to describe how academic managers need to be flexible while engaged in their work.

Knowing who you are, knowing your environment, and being available enough to be flexible and to be fluid and be pulled into the environment and be totally engaged.

Participant 4 shared how brutal their experience as an academic manager had been. They indicated that they were unaware if they would still serve as an academic manager the following year. They noted that political skills, along with fundraising, were essential for future academic managers. They also discussed the evolution of the presidency and where it stands today.

I would guess its 50/50 whether I'll be a dean next year, and the fact that I'm honest doesn't help. So, I truly believe that the better storyteller these people are... that'll help their survival. Fundraising abilities are critical. Any business skills help. There's way too many universities hiring people that don't know a debit from a credit, what fixed costs are versus variable costs. I draw on what I learned in my MBA every day. Now know these people must be a lot smarter to be able to pull things off with no MBA because I can't... I couldn't survive without the MBA. It just wouldn't work for me. So, I think having business skills is more important. The era of having afternoon teas over at your house are gone. You know that the president did that was kind of the stately leader of the university so much more brutal type of existence now.

Finally, participant 5 shared how today's academic managers sometimes make tradeoffs that can impact them negatively. They also shared how integrity and the ability to lead across multiple audiences were skills future academic managers needed to succeed.

...what you're calling academic capitalism, that they are making the same kind of trade-offs that corporate leaders do and they get caught in a bind in they make some trade-off because of prestige of this person or donations here or this or that or marketing or whatever. They don't make the decisions they should, and I'm hoping we'll get through that era and say no, no, we have to get back to the kind of leaders that know this kind of

institution is like the church, we're not a church, but like the church, we are held to a different standard on honesty and integrity and leadership and knowledge.

They went on to conclude:

The problem in academia right now, we are hiring people who can lead amongst one audience but not necessarily a multitude of audiences. So, we're not, generally, I don't know many universities that are hiring people who don't have leadership capabilities, but the ambidextrous – multi-dextrous and to say yes with legislators, with corporations, with alumni, with football fans, with faculty, and with you know, students and general public and parents. Can you be a leader amongst them all? That's where the integrity comes in. Don't say you will if you won't. You know, don't make your stories... your narrative details can change, but your story is the same no matter who you're with but recognize when you're with a different audience. When you're with academicians, and they want to know why you changed admissions. It's a different audience than when you're with the legislators. It shouldn't be a different story. It's different nuance details on what were some of the factors, and you shouldn't be afraid if those details leaked out. They just may not be interesting to some audiences like they are other. So to me, what I see leaders not as good as they need to be is reading the room and keeping their integrity. So, I think the job for a university like us... the reason why I was asked to apply for a lot of presidencies, and I didn't want to is because I see the job as mostly working with legislators, alumni, and athletics and Provosts are left to run the university. But Provosts can't be idiots with legislators, alumni, and Athletics. I mean, you have to bow to everything, but you yeah, but likewise, the president can't be an idiot with the students and the faculty and the staff who are making things run. So, I see it has been it's less of a one-person show anymore, and it's more of a partnership even it smaller institutions, but I think people have to love the job they have, which is hard because Deans do more fundraising than Provosts do and Presidents do more fundraising. So, most Deans don't necessarily do good as a Provost. But some will. I think we have to decide.

Reduced Shared Governance and Faculty Composition

Shared governance within higher education has been reduced tremendously over the last 30 years. The literature review and findings sections of this study show how a shift in higher education occurred and why capitalism's encroachment has impacted academic managers. Faculty have indicated that they feel the change and are concerned with their mental health and the lack of space and time within the academy. Academic managers provided evidence of corporate managerial techniques implemented throughout higher education as a result of the shift. There are multiple reasons why I conclude that shared governance is in jeopardy if not

already demolished in principle but remains in name only. Due to limited resources, academic managers prioritize external influences and are dependent upon funding more than they ever have been before. Academic managers are managing higher education institutions as nonprofit corporations to ensure accountabilities to appease external constituencies. Lastly, faculty composition has changed as more institutions rely on non-tenure-track, adjunct, and contingent faculty to meet academic units' teaching needs.

The role of contingent faculty is multifaceted. On one hand, institutions utilize contingent faculty (adjunct or full-time non-tenure-track faculty) to provide economic relief to stressed higher education budgets. Academic managers will cite cost as a reason to not hire tenure-track faculty positions and instead hire contingent faculty to deliver the curriculum. Academic managers often require departments to subsidize learning with contingent faculty because of the ability to utilize them when needed at a reduced cost with no long-term commitment from the institution. “Professors are commodities to be exploited and traded, and academic administrators are managers whose decisions make shared governance and due process inefficient and unnecessary” (Andrews, 2006, pg. 17.).

In 2013, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2013) released a report that put out eight recommendations. The first recommendation is below:

Institutional policies should define as “faculty” and include in governance bodies at all levels individuals whose appointments consist primarily of teaching or research activities conducted at a professional level. These include (1) tenured faculty, (2) tenure-track faculty, (3) full- and part-time non-tenure-track teachers, (4) graduate-student employees and postdoctoral fellows who are primarily teachers or researchers, and (5) librarians who participate substantially in the process of teaching or research. Those individuals whose primary duties are administrative should not be defined as faculty.

The second recommendation concluded, “Eligibility for voting and holding office in institutional governance bodies should be the same for all faculty regardless of full- or part-time status”

(AAUP, 2013). Their third recommendation explicitly proclaimed that “faculty governance must be exercised to be real” (AAUP, 2013).

AAUP released this report to attempt to strengthen shared governance between faculty and academic administration. Regardless of motive whether it be fiscal or isolated governance, academic managers have created an educational enterprise that is primarily taught by contingent faculty who have no say in the shared governance of an institution. Research indicates that a large function of shared governance is a healthy, active, and engaged faculty senate that works in tandem with academic managers to ensure long-term interest remains a priority in the institution's overall governance. Within this study, academic managers shared their perspectives on the tenure process and faculty composition during the study. They overwhelmingly concluded that higher education would increase contingent faculty instead of increasing tenure-track faculty lines.

When I asked the academic managers directly about the reduction of tenure-track faculty lines within higher education and the increase in non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty, they all referenced the cost of hiring and supporting a full-time tenure-track faculty member in comparison to the offset of hiring senior lecturers, lecturers, and adjunct faculty. Participant 4 shared that they didn't necessarily think it was the right thing to do but cited a lack of resources as the main reason for the decrease in full-time tenure-track faculty.

I don't necessarily think it's great. I mean it's... you've got a two-tiered system. So, you've got a faculty member producing research that isn't that valuable or in demand making two hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year, and then to compensate for that, you're hiring a bunch of adjuncts who have a master degree, and for that, you're paying them \$5,500 a course... we pay a lot of adjuncts to come in and teach because we can't afford people on faculty lines. And so, do I want to pay a hundred and twenty for a nine-month faculty member who's going to teach maybe four to six courses a year, that's \$20,000 a course, or you can pay an adjunct \$5,500.

Participant 1 reinforced that reducing tenure-track faculty wasn't the best for the future of higher education but also cited that it comes down to "simple dollars and cents."

I have not run into a dean, or a vice-chancellor, or anybody that would disagree with the fact that we need more tenure-track faculty, including myself. I really believe that tenure-track faculty and the research and teaching they do hand-in-hand is important for the institution. It's important for the future, etc. So, I think that there's a certain sadness I think among academic managers about the fact that we've had to hire more non-tenure-track faculty. With all that said, it's a simple dollars and cents argument in a lot of ways. We cannot afford to hire enough tenure-track faculty to teach 27,500 students, we just simply can't afford it. It's not only the basic salaries but the other kind of support that they require for their scholarship to be successful. There's a need there that hasn't been around before, perhaps because the other thing that happens a lot of institutions have grown in size. We've added 10,000 students in the last ten years to the student body. We went from 17 or 18,000 up to 27,000 and we did that, and a lot of the teaching that is done are done by non-tenure-track faculty instead of tenure track faculty. Because to create enough revenue, cause remember the state's support has been flat for those ten years, to create enough revenue to pay for tenure-track faculty we'd had to increase the tuition probably 4 or 5 percent more than we did every year. That's not a sustainable model. So, what's happened as there's been a growth of this basically non-tenure-track teaching faculty. I think they're here to stay because I see no business model that would help us in that area, but I think what will change is the treatment of those individuals.

Participant 2 agreed that it is a result of a loss of revenue. They concluded that a more diverse workforce, which includes adjuncts and non-tenure-track faculty, is a good thing for higher education.

Well, I think you'll find a wider array, I think generally deans are pragmatic about it. I've got 15 sections of English 101 that I got to teach, I can only have 3-4 per person, If I got to pay for a tenured professor to teach those sections, you know, it's costing me a lot. If I can hire someone who is capable of teaching it, but doesn't cost as much...So... It's transactional in that respect. Um I think you'll find others who regret that, who are saddened by the fact that we've gone that route. And ah -But you know it's really, it was kind of precipitated by the growth that happened at the beginning of the 60s, I think, with higher ed really expanding and increasing numbers and then funds starting to get cut, well, you can't support all of those tenured professors with the reduced funds. So, it's a pragmatic decision in that respect.

So, I think it's good for the institution to have a more diversified workforce-with respect to job classifications, tenure, or non-tenure, then we've had in the past. We simply can't afford for everyone to be tenured. So, I think it's good for the institution to have a more diversified workforce-with respect to job classifications, tenure, or non-tenure, then we've had in the past. We simply can't afford for everyone to be tenured.

Participant 5 shared how their institution had reorganized the non-tenure-track faculty lines to add multiple options: senior lecture, associate instructional professor, etc. They indicated that although the non-tenure-track faculty are great instructors, possibly better than tenure-track faculty, they aren't the equivalent of tenure-track faculty. They shared that non-tenure-track faculty members can serve in the faculty senate and participate in shared governance.

I know a lot of people are hiring these non-tenure-track faculty for the cheapness of covering classes, and I'm not saying we haven't done some of that. We, for three decades, have had most of our freshman Chemistry taught by people holding PhDs, but who are not focused on research. They were Lecturers or Senior Lecturers, and then about ten years ago, we got them the title of Associate Instructional Professor or Associate Professor, Instructional Professor. And these people are dedicated to how to teach Chemistry better, and they do a really good job of it. Probably better than a tenured faculty would teach 300 freshmen, but that's what they do, you know, and that's the career path they have chosen. So, we're in a place where we get to choose how to do that more carefully. I'm not saying we always do, but we get to choose more carefully than a lot of schools get to choose how they have to do that. I'm glad of that. I would be cautious about it. It's not that I don't believe in the APT [adjunct-part-time] faculty. I do, and I believe they're dedicated, but I do think there are some reasons why you want to be careful about how many adjuncts and part-timers you use. That's why I can say we really come from a different place because even the non-tenured faculty, very few are adjuncts and part-timers. They're almost all full-time doing this, and they specialize in it.

The academic managers in this study clearly understood the implications and trade-offs that came with increasing contingent faculty rather than tenure-track faculty. They admitted that the best interest for higher education is to hire tenure-track faculty. They themselves all came through the tenure-track faculty ranks to rise as an academic manager. They simply made a judgment call prioritizing immediate gains to educate students and adhering to a reduced budget and forgoing the long-term value (shared governance) of higher education. Faculty composition explicitly impacts shared governance and the future of higher education. It is evident that faculty composition and the value of shared governance are eroding as a result of the embrace of academic capitalism.

Finally, participant 3 explained how they thought that the reduction of tenure-track faculty could be dangerous. However, they provided reasons why there is a desire to increase professional expertise from outside the university to teach specific courses. They shared that part-time and adjunct faculty are also more willing to teach online and are more flexible. They also cited that tenure's future is in jeopardy as they see the industry moving farther and somewhat away from more tenure-track faculty.

As a person who studies universities, I understand how that is so dangerous. It's just so dangerous. Also, when I state that it's very politicized on our academic freedom, I value tenure in a way that I did not when I was going through the tenure process, nor did I understand it. Teachers have got to have the ability and the cover to teach their best without, um, fear of reprisal. You know, so academic freedom is very important. Tenure is very important. But I also recognize that we cannot afford to deliver the programs without having more part-time, more adjuncts...oh, and that other side of it too is, let's also be clear- just like you described in the example where we wanted to offer a course on enrollment management. It's not lost on me that it's a powerful thing for me to be able to say that our colleague that I've constantly referenced... Jose is going to be teaching a course on enrollment management in our program. To have the vice president of enrollment management to be affiliated with our program. We also have a person in the board of regents, one of the assistant commissioners who's teaching a course on policy boards. There's a level of expertise that practitioners bring on the spot, on the moment real-time that our scholars that are full-time instructional faculty...we may not necessarily, you know, have the breadth given what we do for a living. So, I'm not lost on the kind of value-added, but everything from accreditation for certain programs that dictates that they have to be taught by tenure track faculty, to push back even as we grow... like we're trying to grow our online programs to have it as many as 25 to 30,000 students. We don't have the instructional capacity right now based on just our tenure-track...tenure and tenure track faculty, so we're going to have to use instructors because our tenure track and tenured faculty sometimes say, 'I wasn't trained to teach online. That's not what I want to do. Find somebody else.' You're always worried about the quality or the value-added of having a tenure-track as opposed to a clinical professor. But it..it weighs on me very heavily. On a regular basis, I have difficult conversations with faculty in our schools about what we going to do in lines. The only way that we can survive in some cases is cannibalize lines. But we know for a fact that that sets a bad precedent, and we go back to academic affairs and ask for more lines. If we cannibalized the line, then it looks like a poor use of resources. So, I'm very sensitive to the changing kind of market that says that... there may very well be the case that ten years from now, there may not be tenure-track jobs anymore. There may be a totally different way to do this. I'm not necessarily saying here, but it looks like that's where the market might be headed.

It is evident via national data and supported by the academic managers' responses in this study that there is a reduction in force of tenure-track faculty occurring within the academy. This reduction is directed explicitly towards tenure-track faculty and what all academic managers cited as a lack of resources. Not just the resources to pay the tenure-track faculty, but also to support their research and continued professional development. During my time as an academic manager, I've found a way to identify an administrator's priorities – simply look at the budget. There is indeed a reduction in state funding for higher education; however, there have been substantial increases in tuition and fees to offset that reduction.

Academic managers have set constructing new buildings, implementing technology in response to external forces, and adding administrative overhead to manage the institution as the priority over maintaining a majority tenured and tenure-track faculty. Shared governance is a foundation of higher education, and when there continues to be a reduction in force for tenure-track faculty, there will be a reduction in shared governance. This new phenomenon will add to the university's corporatization, and there are severe implications for all constituents within the academy.

Impacts of the Shift from Collegiality to Competition

Bernard Burnesa, Petra Wendb and Rune Todnem wrote an article in 2014 called, *The changing face of English universities; Reinventing collegiality for the twenty-first century*. They provide evidence about how universities across the globe are experiencing managerialism and how institutions should reinvent collegiality. They are explicit in citing the definition of collegiality and its importance within higher education.

Collegiality at its root constitutes a recognition of the importance of participation in decisions about the operation and the purpose of a university, i.e. how best 'to participate in the generation, dissemination, and application of knowledge which contributes to the further development of society.' Excluding academics from involvement in such

decisions has led to a growing alienation of staff in universities, which in turn has been detrimental both to senior managers' attempts to achieve the changes they need to make and to the job satisfaction and motivation of staff.

With the culmination of all of the factors outlined within this study, the realization that higher education is more competitive today than ever before is unquestionable. Higher education institutions compete for revenue, resources, students, and prestige, but they respond to external influences demanding greater accountability. Concurrently, higher education institutions and academic managers have responded by embracing nonprofit corporate managerial ethos that has changed faculty and staff's work environment. With the reduction of tenured and tenure-track faculty, collegiality is on the road to termination in the context described above.

Although I did not ask the participants about the shift from collegiality to competition, I think reading this study gives insight into their perspective as academic managers. I conclude that academic managers are aware of the shift. They engage in infringing activities – whether directly or indirectly – to further perpetuate the change. They understand the danger associated with the decline in collegiality.

Higher education finds itself in a pivotal and challenging moment in history. The nearsighted ramifications for higher education institutions will likely continue to operate as nonprofit corporations. There will be institutions that don't meet budgetary expectations and, as a result, close. The gap between institutions that have and have not will continue to widen. On the extreme side, when you retrospectively evaluate reasons for the fall of the Roman Empire and correlate it with where higher education is today, it can be quite daunting. The Romans continued to be threatened by barbaric tribes. They faced economic troubles and heavily relied on slave labor. They were challenged by the rise of the Eastern Empire – a new culture. They

over-expanded and could not continue to manage efficiently, and they lost their traditional values in the process.

What can higher education learn from the fall of the Roman Empire? After all, we're educators and took coursework in history and humanities – we should be critical thinkers who are skilled in evaluation. If we outsource the teaching and learning exclusively to contingent faculty, what are the remaining tenure-track faculty left to do? How do academic managers manage if the entire academic workforce is contingent faculty who have no vested interest in the sustainability and shared governance of the institution? Perhaps it is easier for academic managers to make changes and enact more audits and regulations. But academic managers are temporary and transitional. Who preserves institutional values, history, and the institution's long-term interest? Perhaps the greatest lesson for us to know about the fall of the Roman Empire is that it didn't happen overnight. It took 1,000 years. Is higher education fighting wars that it can't win in an economy that it can't handle? Time will tell.

Conclusion

This study provides excellent insight into academic capitalism and its impact on how academic managers lead higher education institutions today. It reveals priorities, philosophies, and the implementation of management strategies utilized by modern-day academic managers. Participants spoke freely and provided their truths along with their constructed realities of managing their academic units. After collecting and synthesizing the data, three themes emerged: 1) the rise of educational entrepreneurialism to gain resources within higher education, 2) the increased competitiveness among students, institutions, and faculty, and 3) a greater demand for accountability since the value of high education has shifted to a from a public good to a private interest.

Academic managers provided great insight into their realities. They are in a difficult situation and I do not think there is a winning proposition for them as they contemplate the influence of external factors and constituents and their impact on the academy. Reduced state funding has required higher education and academic managers to embrace, promote, and celebrate entrepreneurialism. The term “entrepreneurialism” in industry is usually associated with values such as creativity, innovation, and freedom. In the context of higher education, academic managers revealed how entrepreneurialism challenges the foundation of higher education and unmanaged can be destructive to research, scholarship, and the academy.

The consistent need to increase revenue and resources necessitates energy and time from academic managers requiring them to exclusively prioritize funding: enrollment growth, commercializeable research, external research grants. By prioritizing funding, academic managers have created an environment that is highly competitive. Increasing prestige, rankings, and student success rates all directly impact an institution’s ability to increase funding. The more selective you are, the better student you have correct? The more qualified your faculty are, therefore external grant funders are more likely to donate and shape research at your institution instead of your competitors.

Finally, academic managers shared how increased accountability from external constituencies has shaped their work, faculty workloads, and the academy. Concurrently, state legislatures have reduced funding for higher education while applying immense pressure, via laws and policies, that micromanage academic workloads. External pressure from accrediting agencies, parents, and society has also shaped the daily operations of higher education. In addition, academic managers have prioritized funding other initiatives over building a robust tenure-track faculty who shares in the governance of the institution. The result is a further divide

regarding the value of higher education and whether it is a public or private good. Future academic managers will not likely be successful in meeting all of the demands of the many constituency groups that have a vested interest in higher education. Further investigation into these themes might reveal additional challenges not discovered in this study. The results of this student should cause concern for all internal and external constituencies who have a vested interest in higher education's long-term success.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final chapter, I will review how relevant literature shaped the concept for this study, the methodology utilized, findings of this study, implications of capitalism on academic managers, the impact of academic capitalism on each constituent group, and options and directions for future research. Within the problem statement of the study, I indicated that there was substantial literature that concluded that capitalism has encroached into higher education. Scholars have produced research that substantiates the impacts of capitalism on faculty and the field of higher education. This study was designed to specifically look at academic managers and gain a better understanding of their perceptions, managerial philosophies, and culture. Initially, I went into the study with an understanding that there has been an increase in accountability, reduced state funding, and the engagement of academic managers in market-like behaviors. What the study further revealed is that academic managers are responding to an evolving environment molded by external influencers; they are unaware of the long-term implications of academic capitalism; and, they are serving as catalysts for the implementation and increasing continuation of capitalist managerial ethos within the academy. Academic managers are aware that the academy's historical principles and long-term pillars are in jeopardy; however, they perceive the transition as needed and are resolved to modify the academy to meet the expectations of an evolved neo-liberal society.

Review of Findings

The literature review within this study focused on three factors that have impacted higher education and have cultivated the current environment: globalization, academic capitalism, and neoliberalism. Globalization created a new economy, compressed space and time, created new

forms of communication, introduced technology, promoted massification, created a focus on prestige, heightened entrepreneurialism, and challenged the notion of higher education as a public good. Academic capitalism created a culture for higher education where institutional and professional market or market-like activities have been leveraged to secure external money.

I specifically wanted to look at academic managers at land grant institutions within the southwest United States because of the particular mission of these institutions. I was interested to see if their missions had drifted. If so, how far? What role, if any, did academic managers play in that drift? As the primary data instrument, I utilized context-dependent inquiry using inductive data analysis with the data gathered from interviews and observations. To maximize credibility, I ensured that there was an audit trail composed of a reflexive journal, tape recordings of the interviews, verified transcripts from participants, and detailed field notes. To generate the findings and themes, data were unitized and coded to produce themes.

Academic Capitalism Term

The first finding uncovered from the study revealed that academic managers are unaware of the term academic capitalism. Although the academic managers did do some research in preparation for their interviews and observations, they did not inherently show a deep understanding of the term. The quote that I shared to open chapter four, “If a fish were an anthropologist the last thing it would discover would be water,” is important to the findings. Margret Mead was describing the culture and how culture is taken for granted by members of society who share it. Academic managers help to create and cultivate a culture of academic capitalism yet they are unaware of the immediate and long-term implications on their institution and the academy. Being aware of a practice that impacts the culture of your institution is important in how academic managers lead higher education institutions. Perhaps it might not

change their minds or the final decisions that have to be made, but understanding institutional culture might help guide academic managers in how to present, deal with, and ultimately solve issues and concerns from faculty, staff, and students. My hope is that this study will help provide a perception of how academic capitalism has impacted the way academic managers lead higher education institutions today. The insights will help faculty, staff, students, boards of regents, and academic managers themselves gain a better understanding of the impact capitalism plays in higher education.

Emerging Themes

There were three prominent themes that emerged from the study. The three themes that surfaced were: entrepreneurship, competitiveness, and accountability. Within each of the three themes, there were sub-categories that emerged that supported the overarching theme. Each of the themes had substantial data extracted from the interviews and observations to be designated as a stand-alone theme however, in many instances the themes are intersectional. Higher education is complex, therefore the three themes should not be viewed as solely independent of each other but rather as capitalist pillars interweaving seamlessly within the daily operation of a university.

Entrepreneurism

Perhaps the most dominant theme that emerged from the data was entrepreneurship. Academic managers pride themselves on the promotion of entrepreneurship and cited that they promote those who support and engage in entrepreneurship as well. Academic managers cited entrepreneurship as a behavior that has evolved out of a need to increase revenue and resources for higher education institutions. They argue that institutions have become resource-dependent with the stark decline in state funding for higher education. This new resource-dependent

environment, accompanied by state funding structures that rely heavily on enrollment, requires academic managers to be entrepreneurial in their management of several functions of the university, specifically with enrollment management. Academic managers shared how they leverage entrepreneurialism in the methods utilized to recruit and retain students to generate more credit hours and expand headcount in a direct effort to subsidize their divisional and department budgets. In addition to growing enrollments, academic managers detailed how they leveraged external partnerships to impact institutional funding. The partnerships were described as gateways to resources and revenue via commercializeable research, sponsored research, collaborative research, grants, and intellectual property. Not only are academic managers engaged in the expansion of these partnerships, but faculty are also engaging in external partnerships that yield funding to help subsidize their salaries and graduate teaching assistants. Challenges surfaced via the research as most academic managers cited that available external partnerships can be isolated to science and engineering departments, creating an uneven playing field among other areas of the university.

Increase Competitiveness

The second theme that emerged from the data was the increase in competitiveness, not only with enrollment but with prestige and rankings as well. Academic managers described how there is a greater demand to increase prestige and rankings to become more competitive among other institutions to attract new students. Academic managers provided in-depth details about how they not only had to compete for prestige and rankings with prospective students but also among prestigious faculty in an effort to recruit them to their institution to maximize departmental prestige and scholarship. Academic managers revealed that with the increase in

competition there also was an increase in accountability from constituencies within and external to the university.

Increased Accountability

In an effort to respond to the current neo-liberal environment, academic managers spoke about the newly adapted corporate management techniques they employ to respond to internal and external pressure to audit and quantify work within the university. Academic managers shared how there has been a gradual but rather substantial shift in the way they manage daily work, faculty, and staff. They cited influence from state and federal legislatures, boards of regents, and parents, in addition to a societal shift in perspective regarding the public debate of higher education as a public- or private good.

Non-profit corporation

The above-mentioned three themes emerged directly from the research and provide a realistic perspective on how academic managers lead higher education institutions today. I concluded that the three themes created an environment in which academic managers are really managing institutions as nonprofit corporations rather than educational institutions. The management of a once educational institution must now be managed as a complex capitalistic enterprise where new managerial techniques are employed to ensure the greatest production from faculty and staff. The shift to non-profit corporate management requires academic managers to be skilled in the areas of production management, human resource management, entrepreneurialism, and strategic planning. These new required skill sets are oftentimes not associated with academic managers who once served as faculty members and then navigated the administrative ranks to executive leadership within higher education institutions.

Shared Governance

The redefined environment requires academic managers to manage educational institutions as non-profit corporate entities causing concerns with shared governance. One of the major pillars of non-profit corporate management is the evaluation of human capital relative to the returns on investment. Within higher education, there is strong quantitative data, along with qualitative data from this study, that outline that there is a sharp decline in hiring tenure-track faculty. Under the non-profit corporate model, academic managers are subsidizing tenure-track faculty positions with lecturers and adjuncts to reduce salary budgets in an effort to reallocate funds to other areas. Literature informs us that strong shared governance models are dependent upon faculty engagement and representation in decision-making of the academic enterprise. With the reduction of tenure-track faculty, shared governance is at risk.

Collegiality - Governance and Decision-Making Structure

Waters (1989) provided an analysis of Max Weber's writing on collegiality and concluded, "Whereas bureaucracy is hierarchical and rule-governed and specifies individual accountability for members, collegiality is internally egalitarian and consensus governed and specifies individual autonomy for members" (Water, 1989, p. 969). In Robert Birnbaum's book titled *How colleges work, The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*, he provides 'rules' for leaders to be effective in collegial institutions. Those rules include: 1) live up to the norms of the group, 2) conform to group expectations of leadership, 3) use established channels of communication, 4) do not give an order that will not be obeyed, 5) listen, 6) reduce status differences, and 7) encourage self-control. By definition alone, current academic managers leading institutions with a capitalistic managerial framework cannot seemingly meet the rules outlined by Birnbaum.

This study concludes that academic capitalism is flourishing within institutions and the academy is at an inflection point where reverting to “normalcy” is not likely. Therefore I concluded that leading in a collegial fashion is implausible in institutions entrenched with academic capitalism. Administrators who respect and were possibly brought up in a higher education environment might personally have a deep understanding and appreciation of collegiality but will find themselves operating in direct contradiction of the rules outlined by Birnbaum. Academic capitalism has required administrators to align and prioritize entrepreneurship, competitiveness, accountability, and the adoption of corporate managerial techniques. As a result of the adaptation of the non-profit corporation management philosophy, newly deconstructed communities within higher education institutions are evolving. The majority of institutional shared governance and decision-making has shifted from internal constituencies (faculty and staff) to external constituencies (agencies, state and federal governments, and funding opportunities).

Implications

There are several implications for various stakeholders associated with higher education institutions. The results and conclusions of this study have implications on boards of regents, administrators, faculty/staff, state legislators, and parents and students. Given the severity of the implications, I find it appropriate to break down the implications as they relate to each population. The implications for each population are laid out below.

Boards of Regents/Trustees

University boards of regents perhaps have the greatest influence on higher education today. Most boards are appointed by the state governor and confirmed by their individual state legislatures. They are a governing body tasked with legal and policy authority to ensure that the

missions of the institution are carried out. In addition, they hire the university president, craft policy, and ensure positive financial management of the institution. These responsibilities, by default, provide boards of regents with a great deal of authority and influence on higher education.

As this research study documents, over the course of the last twenty years, state funding for higher education has been reduced and an emerging neo-liberal philosophy has impacted the perception of higher education as a private good. Boards of regents are oftentimes caught in between meeting the expectations of states, adhering to their own external business frameworks, and understanding the operational culture of higher education. The implications of this study can help boards of regents gather a better understanding of how funding, neo-liberal philosophies, and market-like activities impact higher education.

Perhaps the greatest implication of boards of regents is for them to recognize the impact of reduced funding on higher education. There is a continual struggle between meeting the expectations of the state and the financial obligations of students and families that are seeking higher education. Boards of regents can use this empirical evidence to advocate for additional state funding to help academic managers appropriately fund their institutions without having to execute non-profit corporate techniques. As stated in the study, these non-profit corporate techniques impact faculty, staff, and students as well as shared governance. Boards of regents can use their position and voice to help ensure the long-term success of the institution includes shared governance equally with financial stability.

One of the functions of the board is to hire and select presidents. The research within this study should inform boards of regents and give them pause regarding the idea of selecting a candidate who is not well-versed in academics or does not value shared governance. The

implications of selecting a president outside of higher education can be severe if the person is not open to learning and adapting to the higher education culture and environment. The draw of hiring external candidates as presidents have risen and there are more boards that are open to the idea of selecting a president that does not fit the higher education mold for several reasons. Presidents without academic experience usually have external management philosophies that align and exploit human capital to manage the institution as a business enterprise rather than an educational enterprise. The evidence of those non-profit management techniques impacts the institution and the president's long-term success in cultivating a collegial and collaborative environment.

Academic managers within this study provided skill sets that they believed future academic managers will need to attain and develop to be successful in managing higher education institutions. Boards of regents can take those skill sets and encourage their campus administration to begin professional development opportunities for academic managers to learn while they are escalating through the academic ranks in search of leadership. These activities include fundraising, establishing and cultivating external partnerships, and generating revenue through the creation of various revenue streams (enrollment, etc.). Each of the academic managers interviewed shared how they learned on the job during this process and agreed that having these skill sets prior would have benefitted them, and their institution, greatly.

Certainly, boards of regents have the responsibility to create policy and financially manage the institution but, perhaps a new responsibility could be to advocate for additional higher education funding from the state to help reduce the cost of higher education for students and families. In addition, ensuring that professional development is available and relevant for future generations to lead complex institutions will be vital to the long-term success of higher

education. All in all, members of the boards of regents have a lot of influence within their region and state and are best suited to craft and share the narrative that higher education is a public good and advocate for the expansion of higher education funding to impact more students.

Administrators

University administrators currently serving higher education institutions have perhaps already concluded that being a successful administrator is an uphill battle. Due to the complexities of higher education, administrators must serve and meet the needs of multiple internal and external constituencies, requiring them to often make decisions that can appease one constituency group while alienating another. Some of the participants in the study were candid in sharing that the quest for higher education administration could already be considered a failed venture. When I asked participant 4 in the study what they thought about his time as a future administration he shared, “I don't think it's a winning proposition to go into. I'm in my fifth year. I'm close to the end of my fifth year and I really question every day if it's a winnable game,” (Participant 4). Literature also indicates that there is a surge of retiring administrators, specifically presidents, who have served and are at or near retiring age and opt to be done with their careers as executive leaders within higher education. In addition, with the onset of COVID-19, the greater demand of management and innovation has all but forced executive administrators to either reinvent themselves or bow out of the arena of higher education administration.

Skill Sets for Future Academic Managers

Although the outlook is daunting for future higher education administrators, there are those of us who believe that we can somehow manage all of the complexities associated with higher education administration and make a difference in the lives of our students, faculty, and

staff. For those current and aspiring administrators, the implications of this study provide insight into and areas for development in preparation for future administrators. Participants in the study provided rich data regarding what specific skill sets they felt they were lacking prior to becoming an academic manager as well as skill sets they identified future candidates would need in a rapidly changing environment.

The skill sets range from strategic planning to identifying additional revenue streams and cultivating and exploiting external partnerships to expand outcomes. Most of the academic managers within the study indicated that there was no formal training to attain these skill sets and urged the higher education arena to provide experiences and intentional training to reduce the deficit for future administrators. For those administrators who are currently serving in administration but strive to become president or provost, I encourage them to begin engaging in activities, training, and ventures that will help you build these skill sets so that you are able to reference these experiences when you've launched a campaign for a promotion to an executive administrator. I caution them to also understand the implications of such tactics within the academy and encourage them to always practice shared governance allowing for the campus to weigh in, adapt, and mold the eventual outcome of decisions that are worthy of such evaluation.

Current Administration & Professional Development

For the current executive administrators who are serving as provosts and presidents, this study helped to further reveal that there is a shift within the academy among faculty, staff, and academic managers. A section of this study revealed how academic managers manage faculty. The literature also informs us that faculty feel the shift in their work environment. This shift has created additional workload, increased audit trails, and molded a new culture of intrusive accountability to reign. Current administrators may not be able to single-handedly change the

culture on their own campus or within the academy but should be aware of the current dynamics impacting faculty to better understand their perspective and respect the ideals of academic freedom, work-life balance, professionalism, and shared governance.

In addition to understanding modern dynamics and culture that impact faculty, current administrators can certainly heed the advice that surfaced from the participants in this study by creating opportunities for staff and academic managers to get experience in their current roles as they seek to move into executive administration. A challenge to all executive administrators is to build in-house professional development programs that afford, not only current academic managers, but also mid-level managers the opportunity to work on special projects that can help support the institution's growth but also afford aspiring academic managers the opportunity to garner first-hand experience in fundraising, strategic planning, establishing external partnerships, data analytics, and so forth. These professional development opportunities can be formally set up through a framework that includes meeting times, incorporates an intentional curriculum, and allows for in-depth discussions with current administrators. If there isn't an opportunity for a formal program, this can be done informally whereby the executive administrator reaches out to aspiring academic managers to engage them in and expose them to projects that require the skill sets outlined in this study. There are also multiple external professional development opportunities in which academic managers can engage in to better be prepared for executive administration. Most importantly, current executive administrators must be willing to allow for future leaders to be developed and must see the development of future administrators as **fundamental** to the future of higher education. It is our opportunity, as current higher education administrators and scholars, to ensure that future leaders not only adapt to the new capitalist management techniques that have encroached into the academy, but also to provide a solid

foundation of the importance of the deeply rooted values within higher education: shared governance, academic freedom, and understanding that education is a public good.

The implications of this study provide administrators with multiple learning opportunities. It not only provides a detailed perspective about current academic managers, it also provides skill sets that current academic managers say they needed prior to taking on their current role and denotes what skillsets future academic managers will need to be successful in an academic capitalist environment. With the record number of executive administrators retiring and the belief that academic administration can be a “losing proposition,” current administrators must understand the current capitalist environment that higher education created before and during their tenure. This is not an accusation to lay fault at their feet. Certainly, this study concludes that the reality is that higher education has shifted because of society’s view of education as a private good, globalization, neoliberalism, state legislatures’ reduced funding, increased competitiveness, and the incorporation of new management techniques. However, current administrators likely served as faculty, department chairs/directors, academic managers, and eventually executive administrators having navigated institutions through the 1980s and beyond. With this, they have first-hand experience with the evolution of higher education at multiple levels of the institution.

In conclusion, administrators must understand that their role at the institution is likely going to be short-term. Nationally, most presidents serve 4-6 years on average which can greatly reduce the amount of impact an administrator can have on an institution. Most long-tenured administrators have careers across multiple institutions requiring relocations and reestablishment. Thus, the challenge administrators face is to serve and satisfy multiple internal and external constituents in a short time frame. This is simply unrealistic and I encourage administrators,

above all other things, to embrace, practice, defend, and promote the foundations of higher education as essential during their time managing higher education institutions in the future.

Faculty and Staff

This study sheds light on academic capitalism and how it has impacted faculty in higher education. Although the study was geared toward wanting to better understand academic managers and how they manage higher education institutions entrenched and influenced by capitalism, the findings and implications are relevant and important for faculty and staff. First and foremost, faculty and staff must understand that we are working in a new environment and most internal and external constituents don't understand or acknowledge the new environment. Most faculty, staff, students, parents, and academic managers are not aware of the term "academic capitalism". I would argue that most of the group denoted above do understand that their lives, both personally and professionally, have changed dramatically over the course of the last ten to twenty years and could attribute some of this evolution to the increased role that capitalism plays within society and higher education.

Whether you're a tenured faculty member who is nearing retirement, a junior tenure-track faculty member, non-tenure-track faculty member, adjunct, or staff member you have been impacted by increased accountability, reduced state funding, the rise of entrepreneurialism, reduced shared governance, and the increase of non-profit corporate managerial approaches and philosophies. External influencers have redefined higher education and society has embraced a narrative that values higher education as a private good. The commodification of learning has therefore created an environment where faculty and staff are devalued as professionals and experts but rather classified as conduits responsible for transmitting content to a paying customer.

Understanding our new reality is single-handedly the most important challenge facing higher education faculty and staff today. The shift has created a competitive environment and a new institutional culture that requires faculty and staff to engage, at some level, with capitalism and understand that higher education's survival is tied to funding (money). Academic managers within this study who engaged in capitalistic endeavors and incorporated non-profit managerial techniques did not do so because of their past experiences, but rather from a position of need. They needed to secure resources and revenue in order to sustain, compete, and maximize learning opportunities for faculty, staff, and students. That is a new reality. Academic managers, faculty, and staff who refuse to engage will find themselves on the short end of the stick struggling with decisions of furloughs, closure of programs and institutions, and ultimately out of a career.

All faculty and staff are encouraged to recognize the shift now and begin to engage in this new environment all while educating, defending, and embracing the traditional higher education values. Faculty will need to quantify their impact more efficiently within their department, college, and institution. They will need to seek and exploit external partnerships and resources to support their research agenda, salaries, and provide graduate students an opportunity to engage in teaching and research. In addition, faculty will need to continue to publish peer-reviewed articles, teach, and serve on institutional committees to garner support from administrators and colleagues at their institution and within their field. Faculty will need to be able to track and document auditable progress of student learning, self-development, and academic achievement to be able to justify their impact. The work-life balance that was once a privilege of higher education faculty is eroding fast. With the advent and incorporation of technology, faculty are not only expected to engage promptly but also around the clock. The time that was once reserved

for deep thought, hosting intellectual discussions with scholars, pondering research ideas, and advising graduate students about possible research opportunities and pedagogy improvement are limited. These responsibilities now must be done on their own time and oftentimes after work hours as their regular work time frame will be filled with engaging in the arenas of accountability, documentation, justification, external partnerships, and development of resources to support their salary and graduate assistantships. There will be limited time for them to engage in institutional committees such as the faculty senate, planning and budgeting committees, and diversity task forces.

As for staff, they too are now required to engage in the newly created academic capitalistic environment. For long-tenured staff, they will have to make the adjustment to shift their work into an arena filled with increased accountability, documentation, and justification of their work. In all likelihood, they will become well-versed in corporate managerialism which promotes a perspective that demands returns on any and all investments, establishes and tracks key performance indicators, utilizes data to drive decisions, incorporates techniques that increase enrollment and prestige, and aligns efforts to increase rankings for their institution. Although these corporate management philosophies and tactics have been introduced to higher education, I have found that there is currently not a good infrastructure to support the shift holistically. Partly because these are new to higher education therefore the infrastructure hasn't been fully developed and embraced, but I would warn that as we move toward this reality infrastructures are being built for long-term sustainability. As colleges and universities introduce more academic managers from outside of higher education the shift toward non-profit corporate management will soon become the norm.

The consistent change in leadership among academic management can create an environment where faculty and staff become leery of the intentions of short-term academic managers. The current environment requires academic managers to compete, increase prestige and revenue, and satisfy both internal and external constituents. Academic managers are keenly aware that this proposition can be very challenging and understand that they will intentionally make incremental improvements to the organization before they face the fate of one of two options: get a promotion at another more prestigious institution or get fired because they are unable to satisfy all constituency groups. Faculty and staff must embrace the values and foundations of higher education and hold academic managers accountable to the adherence of these values and foundations while they are serving in leadership.

State Legislators

There are three major implications for state legislators that surfaced from this study: 1) the need for increased funding for higher education, 2) the need to redefine higher education as a public good, and 3) the need for understanding the values and foundations of which higher education was built upon. State legislators have a direct impact on the funding for higher education and could use their public platforms to help society understand that higher education is a public good. In addition, the study reveals how academic capitalism has impacted faculty, staff, and parents/students. Legislators are consistently debating the cost of higher education and student loan debt and are directly responsible for shifting the funding of higher education from the state to their constituencies.

Parents/Students

The current environment impacts parents and students perhaps disproportionately the most. There are several implications that parents and students can take away from this study.

First, the rising cost of higher education is not going to slow down anytime soon. **Second**, students should carefully evaluate options for higher education and determine what is the best option for them considering the current environment. **Finally**, parents and students should understand that higher education is a public good and that completion of a degree doesn't necessarily equate to a guaranteed job or career.

One of the conclusions of this study is that higher education is currently being managed as a non-profit corporate entity. The denotation of "non-profit" can be misleading in that it alludes to the idea that higher education does not exist to seek profit. Although higher education is not seeking a profit they need to increase revenue to ensure that they are able to operate and compete with other institutions by increasing enrollment and prestige for additional revenue. This comes at a cost and the new environment requires academic managers to lead, exploit, and bolster revenue in an effort to be the best institution they can be. Historically, higher education was managed and operated as a charitable enterprise, whereby the focus was primarily on the development of the student, and this did not require sustained revenue increases. Globalization and competition didn't exist at the level that it does today. Previously, this allowed for higher education to focus on how they could increase graduates to economically impact the region and state.

Within the old model, higher education was valued as a public good by society and state legislators alike. As the literature suggests, the shift of higher education toward being viewed as a private good has allowed states to reduce funding that once helped subsidize the cost. Higher education funding has dwindled thereby shifting the responsibility of attending a university from state tax dollars directly to students and parents. Sure, federal and state financial aid is available for students and families who qualify; however, more and more students and families are

experiencing the burden of paying for higher education directly or at least a portion not covered by grants. Until there is another shift in funding for higher education, the cost will continue to rise and fall on the shoulders of those who seek to complete a degree.

Expectations of colleges and universities have also evolved. Students and parents expect amenities and support services to be state of the art for the price that they're committing to by attending a college or university. Parents expect students to have wrap-around services that include intrusive advising, up-to-date residence halls, technology, and learning and recreational facilities that are second to none. These amenities come at a price and that price is filtered directly to the student fee bill. I'm not suggesting that these amenities and support services are not needed, but rather explaining that they come with a price that impacts the total cost of attendance. If parents and students are okay with that, and it seems as if they are, they will continue to experience additional amenities and support services all while the cost continues to rise. If students and parents are concerned about the rising cost of higher education the first step they can take is to advocate state and federal lawmakers to increase funding for higher education. They can also select higher education institutions not for the state of the art amenities and support services, but for applicable degree programs, faculty credentials and experience, and cost of attendance. They can consider dual credit programs, advanced placement credit, and community colleges. Students can attend local community colleges prior to attending a university and/or co-enroll at community colleges and universities at the same time to help reduce the cost of their degree.

Finally, students and parents should know that the main purpose of higher education is to develop students into critical thinkers who are civically engaged contributors to society. With the shift from public to a private good, students and parents accept the falsehood that once they

graduate from college they will automatically get a high-paying job directly tied to their degree (major of study). Higher education has made strides to incorporate Career Services Centers and staff who can help provide training, tips, and connections for students during and after they've graduated from the institution. Many times, first-generation college students do not take advantage of this support service that is included in the rising cost of higher education, believing that the degree itself will get them an interview and job. With the rising demographic of low social-economic first-generation college students attending higher education, it is important that they, and their parents, understand the role of higher education and that some of the responsibility for job attainment post-graduation is dependent upon other influencing actions: internships, work experience, networking, connections, and the like.

Student Learning

This study provides a context within the lens of academic managers and how they lead institutions today. Academic capitalism's impact on faculty work-life is in chapter two, and it will continue to evolve and become more constrained. As a result, student learning in the twenty-first century will change if not be compromised. Not only has the learning environment been radically altered as a result of COVID-19, but the rise of corporate managerial techniques within the academy will also redefine learning. The reduced time and space, rapid incorporation of technology, increased accountability and auditing, promotion of entrepreneurship and competitiveness, and the growth of external influence will not solely redefine faculty work-life; it will also redefine how, when, and where students learn.

The expanded regulation and expectation of faculty will impact student learning. More requirements and restrictions equate to less time and freedom to design coursework, improve pedagogy, and add to scholarship within the discipline. Under the academic capitalism

framework, students are consumers, and a heavily regulated and audited learning environment creates an immense amount of pressure for faculty to adhere and produce. Faculty cannot meet all of the expectations thrust upon them within this newly created environment. They cannot prioritize enrollment, secure funding, expand external partnerships, research, and provide institutional service under extreme regulation while delivering modern and relevant scholarship.

With the increased demand and expansion of online learning, faculty have modified their curriculum, modality, and pedagogy in an unprecedented and unregulated environment. Accrediting agencies and state education commissions already regulate continuous improvement, assessment, and industry standards, so it is safe to assume their responsibilities could expand. Based on historical experience, the auditing and regulation of online learning will become more prominent as external entities become more involved. For example, external entities such as accrediting agencies and state education commissions might require faculty to attend professional development sessions and get certified in “online learning” to ensure quality.

In the era of COVID-19, states are already implementing requirements for public higher education that outline work location requirements, modality delivery expectations, all while eliminating safety requirements such as vaccinations and masks. These types of mandates directly impact student learning - it limits and restricts how institutions can deliver content. If students are afraid to engage in higher education due to a fear for individual safety and institutions have limitations on how many classes they can offer in an online modality, then students will opt not to attend.

All of the above-mentioned factors impact student learning. Students and external entities (parents, state legislators, external associations) might have greater expectations that align higher education curriculum to careers. Still, if the learning does not meet the future industry standards,

higher education can become more irrelevant. Faculty and staff work-life have a direct impact on the student experience. As already concluded, academic capitalism is thriving within higher education; the question becomes, to what extent can all parties be satisfied so much so that education, exploration, and the advancement of scholarship within the academy remain the priority.

The Role of Deception

For this study, I have defined deception as the act of intentionally or unintentionally withholding information - this is different from lying. Almost every actor associated with higher education plays a role of deception under the academic capitalism framework. For example, academic managers cited a requirement of intentionally withholding information from constituents to ensure that they meet expectations. The study revealed several instances where deception was prevalent and expected. In one interview, a dean shared the following statement:

..my wife says that she will not go to any academic events... or any academic events. She says it's social anxiety. I ask why and she says, well when you do expert witness work and you're up on the stand getting grilled by attorneys you know exactly who the enemy is. And you know that if you tell the truth that's going to be an asset. Where at an academic event, you sure don't want to tell the truth and you really don't have a clear idea who's your friend and who's your foe. That was kind of enlightening but yet sobering.

Because higher education has become more competitive, academic managers cited that strategically withholding information could be beneficial. There were times within the in-person observations when academic managers withheld information or opinions to approach a topic strategically. One instance occurred when I attended a Dean's Council meeting, and the group discussed the onboarding of a nursing degree. The dean that I was interviewing did not share any foreseen challenges when the Provost asked the entire group their thoughts, opinions, and foreseeable difficulties with implementing the program. Later during the interview, the dean shared with me that he did have views, opinions, and data to support that the nursing degree

would not be successful. When I asked him why he didn't share that information with the group, he smiled and said that you could not let the left hand know what the right hand is doing in higher education politics.

He explained that withholding information in this instance was an effort to remain collegial rather than harmful. This instance helped me understand that his deceitfulness was not a direct attempt to lie to his internal colleagues but rather to allow progress without providing additional context, hindering complete understanding. Under this purview, deception is rampant in higher education. Parents and students do not understand why institutions continually increase tuition and fees even though state governments are reducing funding allocations for institutions requiring them to pass the cost down to the consumer.

Common practices, coded language, and corporate managerial techniques within higher education are deceptive in nature. Another instance was referenced when I interviewed a former Provost and they shared that they had an entire team dedicated to data analysis on how to improve prestige. The team analyzed data and would provide them with data to increase rankings by simply adjusting an internal algorithm rather than actual intentional progress.

You know, one time somebody did analysis and came to me and said we can put a million dollars in this and it will make this weak thing in our ranking improve and we will probably go up at least two to five points and I was like how will that million dollars help the students? And we were going to invest a million dollars to take our PE classes from 20 or 21 students to 19. Because the cutoff for small classes is less than 20 and so we're going to invest... in you know, the quality of the instruction for 20 students is not different than for 19 and I'm like that million dollars. Why don't we just give that million dollars to you know, bunch of students, you know and stuff like that. I just couldn't do it, but people are doing that analysis for academic leaders to tell them all these ways

In this instance, the academic manager did not elect to deceive the rankings system by implementing the recommendation. Certainly, if the academic manager had agreed to implement the recommendation, it's likely that the academic manager would have withheld intimate details

that helped to bolster rankings. Deception is at play within the academic capitalism framework and constituents must be prepared to probe, challenge, and better understand the purpose and rationale of progress within the institution.

Implications for Further Research

This study involved five land-grant universities and academic managers located in the southwest United States. Four of the universities are Research 1 institutions and one is a Research 2 institution. The academic managers within this study were all presidents/chancellors, provosts, or academic deans. This is the limitation of the study and the findings. Although the data provided via interviews and observations were rich, one consideration for further research would be to expand the geography to include more land-grant institutions. This would help to establish if the findings within this study are exclusive to the southwest region of the United States or if it is more widespread. My suspicion is that the findings would return as conclusive regardless of location, but would encourage other scholars to further investigate.

My guess is that regional universities throughout the United States are also experiencing the impacts of academic capitalism. Additional research would further add to this scholarship and could provide a holistic view of the impact of academic capitalism across multiple categories of institutions within higher education. Future research could also explore how, and whether, academic capitalism has impacted self-funded private, prestigious institutions.

All academic managers within this study were primarily new to their role (1-2 years) and offered great perspective, but additional research could focus on long-tenured administrators who have evolved within higher education to see the incorporation of capitalism within this context. Their first-hand experiences evolved skillsets, and advice could prove to be very useful for future academic managers. Short-term academic managers could also provide insight on their

challenging experiences, guidance on what to avoid, and what to focus on while leading institutions.

The research focused on state legislators' perspectives on higher education funding could really prove to be useful as well. Having a better understanding of their perspective as funders, their limitations as lawmakers and their personal experiences might shed light on why they have not increased state funding for higher education. It could also provide insight into their thinking about the state of higher education and what role they see colleges and universities playing in the future. Boards of regents' perspectives of academic capitalism and what they're looking for in future leaders might also prove to be very useful.

There is a healthy amount of scholarship surrounding academic capitalism and this study provides additional context regarding the implications of academic capitalism on academic managers. Additional research into how academic capitalism impacts specific aspects of the academy should also be of interest to higher education scholarship. Further exploration into academic capitalism's impact(s) on the tenure review process should be conducted. The tenure review process and higher education both have evolved over the course of the last 30 years and it would be interesting to see what role, if any, academic capitalism has played in that evolution. A deep analysis of higher education policy could also reveal a story about the impacts of academic capitalism and its effect on the management of the institution by the board of regents. My intuition is that an analysis of policy over the course of the last twenty years might mirror the transformation that academic managers spoke of within this study. It could also further substantiate the implications of incorporating non-profit corporate management within the academy.

Since one of the largest sections of this study revealed the need to increase enrollment to expand revenue, I think further research about the role that enrollment managers play in academic capitalism is important to understand. As I concluded with the academic managers who participated in this study, I do not believe that enrollment managers are responsible for the incorporation of capitalism within the academy. However, I do think the area of enrollment management is worthy of further research as well as what role this division plays within the academy. Graduate students who play dual roles as teaching or research assistants while being a student should also be engaged. This particular cohort of higher education actors impacts the institution greatly by supplementing the teaching, learning, and research that is commodified within the current environment.

Summary and Conclusion

This study focused on academic capitalism's impact on academic managers at five land-grant institutions within the southwest United States. The results of this study prove that academic capitalism directly impacts higher education and academic managers. Higher education has been transformed with the encroachment and embrace of capitalism creating a new environment that requires academic managers to engage in marketlike activities. The results of this research should be read with caution and concern about the future of higher education.

There is no relief in the grim reality of funding for higher education. State and federal legislators continue to reduce funding passing along the cost of higher education directly to consumers (students and parents). With the impact of COVID-19, higher education has been transformed in the fastest way possible as higher education was required to not only adapt to online learning, but also move all, if not most, support services virtual. With unemployment at an all-time high, reduced revenue in state taxes, and this virtual shift to online higher education, a

very unstable and volatile environment for higher education has been created. As higher education has adapted to capitalism, so too will higher education adapt to this environment.

What will be required of higher education faculty and staff is for us to be diligent in holding strong to norms, values, and foundations that ensure the continuation of shared governance, academic freedom, and work-life balance. To be ignorant of the challenge ahead of us could be detrimental to our institutions. We have to acknowledge the reality that exists where colleges and universities are consolidating and closing leaving fewer opportunities for students to succeed. My challenge to all faculty, staff, and students is to not be the last fish to discover the water around us – go explore, challenge, and adapt!

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J.C. "Globalization" as collective representation: The new dream of a cosmopolitan civil sphere. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 19 (1/2), p. 81-90.
- Altbach, P. G., (2011). Harsh realities; The professoriate in the twenty-first century. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 139-169). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2010). Tracking a global academic revolution. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 42(2), 30-39.
doi:10.1080/00091381003590845
- American Association of University Professors. (2013). *The inclusion in governance of faculty members holding contingent appointments*. Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/file/contingent-inclusion-in-governance_0.pdf
- Andrews, J. (2006). How We Can Resist Corporatization. *Academe*, 92(3), 16-19.
doi:10.2307/40252920
- Arbo, P., & Benneworth, P. (2007). Understanding the Regional Contribution of Higher Education Institutions. *OECD Education Working Papers*. doi:10.1787/161208155312
- Armstrong, P. (2001). Science, enterprise and profit: Ideology in the knowledge-driven economy. *Economy and Society*, 30(4), 524-552. doi:10.1080/03085140120089081
- Austin, A. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.
doi:10.1353/jhe.2002.0001

- Bansel, P., Davies, B., Gannon, S., & Linnell, S. (2008). Technologies of audit at work on the writing subject: A discursive analysis. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(6), 673-683.
doi:10.1080/03075070802457017
- Bauer-Wolf, J. (2019, September 16). Free Speech Laws Mushroom in Wake of Campus Protests. Retrieved February 19, 2021, from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/09/16/states-passing-laws-protect-college-students-free-speech>
- Benjamin, E. (2002). How over-reliance on contingent appointments diminishes faculty involvement in student learning. *Change*, 1995(1975), 1995.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Brooklyn, NY: Zone Books.
- Cantor, N. (2020). Transforming the Academy: The urgency of recommitting higher education to the public good. *Liberal Education*, 106(1/2), 48–55.
- Clabaugh, G. K. (2004). The Educational Legacy of Ronald Reagan. *Educational Horizons*, 82(4), 256-259.
- Cope, D. G. (2014). Methods and meanings: Credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(1), 89-91 3p. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.89-91
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Davis, D. J., Green-Derry, L. C., & Jones, B. (2013). The impact of federal financial aid policy upon higher education access. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 45(1), 49-57. doi: 10.1080/00220620.2013.730502
- deMarrais, K. (2004). Qualitative interview studies: Learning through experience. In K. deMarrais & S.D. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for research* (pp. 51-68). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dollinger, M. (2001). The other war: American jews, Lyndon Johnson, and the great society. *American Jewish History*, 89(4), 437-461,495. Retrieved from <http://lib-ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/228215194?accountid=7082>.
- Ehrenberg, R. G. (2012). American higher education in transition. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(1), 193-216. doi: 10.1257/jep.26.1.193
- Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and John Wiley & Sons, 1990).
- Florida, R., Knudsen, B., & Stolarick, K. (2010). The university and the creative economy. In *Education in the creative economy: Knowledge and learning in the age of innovation* (pp. 45-76). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Giri, A. (2000). Audited accountability and the imperative of responsibility: Beyond the primacy of the political. In M. Strathern, ed. *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy* (pp. 173-95). London: Routledge.
- Gonzalez y Gonzalez, E. M. (2004). Perceptions of selected senior administrators of higher education institutions in mexico regarding needed administrative competencies (Order

- No. 3157028). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (305069686). Retrieved from <http://lib-ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/305069686?accountid=7082>
- Gonzales, L. D., Martinez, E., & Ordu, C. (2014). Exploring faculty experiences in a striving university through the lens of academic capitalism. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*(7), 1097-1115. doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.777401
- Gornall, L., & Salisbury, J. (2012). Compulsive working, 'hyperprofessionalism' and the unseen pleasures of academic work. *Higher Education Quarterly, 66*(2), 135-154. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2273.2012.00512.x
- Hays, D. G. (2012). In Singh A. A. (Ed.), *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings*. New York: Guilford Press. Retrieved from <https://libcat.tamu.edu/vwebv/holdingsInfo?bibId=3919379>
- Harclerod, F. F., & Eaton, J. S. (1999). The hidden hand. In *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 195-224). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hensley, B., Galilee-Belfer, M., & Lee, J. J. (2013). What Is the Greater Good? The Discourse on Public and Private Roles of Higher Education in the New Economy. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 35*(5), 553–567. <https://doi.org/http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjhe20>
- Kallo, J. (2009). OECD education policy. A comparative and historical study focusing on the thematic reviews of tertiary education. Retrieved July 10, 2016, from http://www.kasvatus.net/fera/tekstisivu.tmpl?navi_id=347.

- Kauppinen, Ilkka, and Brendan Cantwell. "The global enterprise of higher education." *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2014. 137-65.
- Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2013). Missing: Evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching and learning with technology in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(3), 327-337. doi:10.1080/13562517.2013.773419
- Kolkhorst defends bill: Legislation requires profs to post syllabi online. (2010, November 27). *The Eagle*, pp. A1, A6
- Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). "A Well-Regulated Faculty ...": The Coerciveness of Accountability and Other Measures That Abridge Faculties' Right to Teach and Research. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11(4), 369–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611414668>
- Lincoln, Y. S. (2012). The Political Economy of Publication: Marketing, Commodification, and Qualitative Scholarly Work. *Qualitative Health Research*, 22(11), 1451-1459. doi:10.1177/1049732312457713
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lester, J. (2006). Who will we serve in the future? The new student in transition. *New Directions For Student Services*, 2006(114), 47-61.
- Mack, E. A., & Stolarick, K. (2014). The gift that keeps on giving: Land-grant universities and regional prosperity. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy Environ. Plann. C*, 32(3), 384-404. doi:10.1068/c11164r
- McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C. (2005). RETHINKING AND REFRAMING THE CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION. (cover story). *Change*, 37(5), 50-57. Retrieved from <http://lib->

ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.lib-

ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=18146277&site=ehost-live

McClure, Kevin ---

McGuinness, A. C., Jr. (2011). The states and higher education. In *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 139-169).

Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1991). Case study research in education. Jossey-Bass. Retrieved from <http://lib->

ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.lib-

ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edshtl&AN=mdp.39015029270157

ezproxy.tamu.edu:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edshtl&AN=mdp.39015029270157
&site=eds-live

Merriam, S. B. (2014). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* John Wiley

& Sons.

Mumper, M. (1996). *Removing college price barriers: What government has done and why it*

hasn't worked. New York: State University of New York Press.

Mumper, M., Gladieux, L. E., King, J. E., & Corrigan, M. E. (2011). The federal government

and higher education. In M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American*

higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges

(pp. 113-138). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Nasseh, B. (1999). Are higher education institutions ready for the 21st century? *Distance*

Education Report, 3(4), 2-5.

Neave, G. R., & Vught, F. V. (1991). *Prometheus bound: The changing relationship between*

government and higher education in western Europe. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Nick Bontis, Nicola C Dragonetti, Kristine Jacobsen, Göran Roos, The knowledge toolbox: A review of the tools available to measure and manage intangible resources, *European Management Journal*, Volume 17, Issue 4, 1999, Pages 391-402, ISSN 0263-2373, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373\(99\)00019-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(99)00019-5).
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Academic capitalism in the new economy: Challenges and choices. *American Academic*. 1 (1). p.37-59.
- Robinson, William I. "Theories of globalization." *The Blackwell companion to globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007. 125-43. Print.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: A history*. Vintage Books, NY.
- Teune, Henry. "Global Democracy." *American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581 (2002): 22-34. Print.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shore, C. & Roberts, S. (1997). Higher Education and the panopticon paradigm: Quality assurance as "Disciplinary technology", *Higher Education Quarterly*, 27 (3): 8-17.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (2000). Coercive accountability. *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, 57-89.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2011). Markets in higher education. In n M. N. Bastedo, P. G. Altbach, & P. J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century:*

- Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 433-464). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Strathern, M. (2000). *Audit cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy*. London: Routledge.
- Snyder, T. D. & Dillow, S. A. (2010). *Digest of Education Statistics 2009*. NCES 2010-13. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Spooner, M. (2017). 'Qualitative Research and Global Audit Culture.'. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research 5th edition*. Thousand Oaks.
- Valimaa, Jussi. "University revolutions and academic capitalism." *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins UP, 2014. 33-54. Print.
- Walker, J. (2009). Time as the fourth dimension in the globalization of higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(5), 483-509. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0061
- Waters, M. (1989). Collegiality, bureaucratization, and professionalization: A Weberian analysis. *American journal of sociology*, 94(5), 945-972.
- Washburn, J. (2005). *University inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education*. New York, NY: Basic books.
- Ylijoki, O., oili-helena.ylijoki@uta.fi. (2013). Boundary-work between work and life in the high-speed university. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(2), 242-255. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.577524
- Public papers of the presidents of the United States L William J. Clinton, Book 1: January 20-July 31, 1993. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994.

APPENDIX A

Sec. 51.402. REPORT OF INSTITUTIONAL AND ACADEMIC DUTIES.

(a) The Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, in cooperation with governing boards, institutional officials, and faculty representatives of general academic institutions of higher education, shall develop and recommend general policies and standard reports for academic faculty workloads and services.

(b) The governing board of each institution of higher education in the state shall adopt rules and regulations concerning faculty academic workloads. In adopting rules under this subsection, each institution shall recognize that classroom teaching, basic and applied research, and professional development are important elements of faculty academic workloads by giving appropriate weight to each activity when determining the standards for faculty academic workload. An institution may give the same or different weight to each activity and to other activities recognized by the institution as important elements of faculty academic workloads. The established rules and regulations of each institution shall be included in the operating budgets of each institution.

(c) Within 30 days of the end of each academic year, the institution shall file with its governing board a report, by department, of the academic duties and services performed by each member of the faculty during the nine-month academic year, showing evidence of compliance with requirements established by the governing board. The report of academic duties and services performed by each member of the faculty shall indicate all appointments held by the faculty member in the employing institution, the salary paid to each appointment, the percent of time of each appointment, and the source of funds from which salary payments were made. Teaching responsibilities in each workload standard shall be in proportion to the portion of salary paid from funds appropriated for instructional purposes.

(d) The institutional head of each higher education institution shall designate the officer of his staff who will monitor workloads, prepare and review appropriate workload reports, and submit the reports to the institutional head for his certification or approval and comments as may be appropriate.

Added by Acts 1977, 65th Leg., p. 1478, ch. 601, Sec. 1, eff. Aug. 29, 1977. Amended by Acts 1987, 70th Leg., ch. 845, Sec. 1, eff. Aug. 31, 1987.

Amended by:

Acts 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., Ch. 573 (S.B. [241](#)), Sec. 1.02,
eff. September 1, 2019.