

Introduction: The Retreat from the Critical

Margaret Thornton

This collection of essays, representing a range of social science perspectives, arose from a concern about the way Australian universities are being affected by a single-minded focus on economic rationality. This has involved the transformation of higher education from a predominantly public to a predominantly private good, which has profound ramifications not only for the future of the public university, but also for the working of democracy. While numerous studies have focused on the deleterious impact of the neoliberal turn on the humanities (e.g Small 2013; Nussbaum 2010; Donoghue 2008), the social sciences have attracted comparatively little attention, although the effect may be no less harmful. It is not only that social science departments are being closed down – although redundancies are an everyday occurrence – but that the social sciences are being constrained in the exercise of their critical role.

State disinvestment in higher education has caused the university's primary role to become more overtly instrumental, for it is now deployed by the state specifically to serve the new knowledge economy. This is not to deny the ideological role played by the university in the service of the state in the past, such as the inculcation of nationalism or the transmission of culture (Readings 1996). However, such a role did not entail the wholesale targeting, recruiting and training of students that is in evidence today. The pressure on public universities is now directed towards producing large numbers of job-ready graduates cheaply in minimum time to serve the needs of industry. The private benefits of higher education are also invariably conceived in economic terms, emphasising vocationalism and wealth accumulation in order to justify a user-pays regime.

The privatising aspect of the new regime, together with the dramatic increase in the number of students, or so-called 'massification', has induced a pronounced shift in terms of both what is taught and how it is taught. In particular, theory and critique are likely to be downplayed, if not discarded altogether, in favour of applied knowledge, which better suits the instrumental aims now in vogue.

The pressure on academics to perform productively and reinvent the self, according to the dictates of the moment, has also profoundly affected academic careers, causing them to become less fulfilling than they once were. The focus is on producing 'world-class research' to enable universities to enhance their prestige and compete on the world stage. At the same time, academics are required to teach more and more students, while collegiality and academic freedom have been eroded in the face of increasing managerialism, a highly gendered phenomenon on which several contributors elaborate.

I set the scene for the collection by overviewing the trajectory of change in higher education policy in Australia over the last quarter of a century that has led to this state of affairs and by briefly addressing its significance for the social sciences. But, first, a word about the neoliberal turn.

The neoliberal embrace

Neoliberalism lacks a precise denotation but encompasses a constellation of values emphasising market freedom – competition, free trade and entrepreneurialism – in conjunction with profit-making and private good. The social acceptance of the 'market metanarrative' (Roberts 1998) is such that liberal democracies are no longer prepared to sustain public goods as was once the norm. Instead, and despite the ostensible moves in favour of deregulation, the state is playing a key role in creating and preserving an institutional framework to facilitate market rationality (cf. Harvey 2005, 3).

From the early 1980s and 1990s, neoliberalism began to impact on Australian public policy under Labor prime ministers Bob Hawke and Paul Keating. A key initiative that laid the foundation for emergence of the free market was the Hilmer Report (1993), which advocated privatising public goods and restructuring the economy around competition, a concept that might be regarded as the leitmotif of neoliberalism. The market began to play a much more significant role with the support of the state, an imperative that was ratcheted up by Liberal prime minister John Howard. He was encouraged by the leading world policy institutions – namely, the OECD (1996), the World Bank (1998) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (1998). What was occurring in Australia,

then, was by no means unique, although Australia's embrace of neoliberalism, particularly so far as higher education policy is concerned, has been particularly ardent.

Public universities were not instantaneously privatised as a result of the neoliberal turn, as commonly occurred with other formerly public goods, such as utilities and public transport. Instead, the process has been an incremental one, involving the increasing application of business practices to them as if they were for-profit corporations. In other words, they have been 'corporatised'. While the federal government has sloughed off a significant proportion of the financial responsibility for higher education, universities have considerably less autonomy than for-profit corporations. They are still nominally public institutions but decisions to lift the cap on student enrolments or to deregulate fees, for example, are made by government in the first instance, not universities themselves. Thus, the application of neoliberal policies to universities has been artfully effected through what might be described as a combination of free-market rhetoric and intense bureaucratic control (Lorenz 2012, 600; cf. Corden 2005).

As a result of the key role now played by the market, the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake à la Newman no longer has the status it once had, for the concepts of efficiency, productivity and usefulness now dominate the managerial discourse that resounds throughout the higher education sector. However, while the extent of the phenomenon is unprecedented in the Anglo-Australian tradition of free, or virtually free, higher education, the potentially negative impact of corporatist and managerial values on the pursuit of learning and independent thought was acknowledged at least a century ago (e.g. Veblen 1957 [1918], 198).

The study of society and culture, which is central to both the humanities and the social sciences, has not disappeared altogether, but there has been a marked turning away from such studies in favour of the functional and the 'relevant', a vogueish concept that has come to mean business-related. Humanistic, critical and theoretical knowledge has been dismissed as 'useless' (Small 2013, 4) in an environment where the labour market is primarily interested in skills, applied knowledge and 'know-how'. Indeed, 'skills' have supplanted traditional forms of knowledge in the public imagination as to what is deemed to be most desirable in a university education, as they have come to be associated with modernisation, success and productivity (Urciuoli 2010). Universities are therefore expected to demonstrate their 'usefulness' by training large numbers of productive workers to support the new knowledge economy and by generating academic capitalism through research.

Universities upside down

The transformation of the Australian university sector began in 1988 when minister John Dawkins incorporated all colleges of advanced education (CAEs) – teaching institutions that did not conduct research – into a uniform higher education system (Dawkins 1988). This resulted in the creation of 16 new universities, forced up school retention rates and ‘convinced a new generation of adolescents that university was the logical course for a post-school commitment’ (Marginson and Considine 2000, 29). Lyotard (1984) had observed only a few years before that knowledge had replaced land, raw materials and cheap labour in the struggle between nation-states. As Australia’s economic performance, long reliant on agriculture and manufacturing, had slipped in OECD rankings (Brett 2003; Casey 2006), the idea of a knowledge-based economy was appealing as it would augment the production of wealth and enable Australia to be more competitive on the world stage. ‘New knowledge’, of the kind Lyotard had in mind, is not synonymous with Newman’s idea of universal knowledge (1966 [1852]), but is a more fluid concept, shaped by informatics, postmodern scepticism and the variability of market needs.

Despite the orchestrated transition from an élite to a mass higher-education system, there was not a commensurate increase in public funding. Instead, the neoliberal imperative induced a shift from free higher education to a user-pays system. Influenced by the gurus of neoliberalism, Hayek (1976) and Friedman (1962), it was accepted that students should assume at least partial responsibility for the cost of their education themselves as a degree would boost their future earnings. A user-pays system inevitably encourages the teaching of applied knowledge and more vocationally oriented courses as student-consumers are necessarily concerned about the return on their investment. Consumerism has therefore been a crucial factor in inducing the education pendulum to swing away from theory and critique towards applied knowledge, or from ‘know what’ to ‘know how’.

To maximise the utility of the user-pays philosophy, a loan scheme was implemented by the Australian federal government based on an idea of Friedman (1962, 105) and developed by Bruce Chapman, an economist at The Australian National University (ANU). The Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS), subsequently known as FEE-HELP, is an income-contingency loan scheme that does not require graduates to begin repayment until they earn a certain level of income (Australian Government, Study Assist). While there were widespread demonstrations from Australian students initially, the language of ‘contributions’ rather than ‘fees’, a moderate A\$1,800 per annum across all disciplines and the deferred repayment scheme served to quell dissent. Also notable is the fact that a large proportion of private school students in Australia pay much higher

fees, despite the fact that such schools are heavily subsidised by the state. Accordingly, the normalisation of the user-pays philosophy in conjunction with a deferred repayment scheme enabled not only an incremental increase in fees but also the imposition of disciplinary-based differences.

In the UK, there were widespread student demonstrations when implementation of the radical recommendations of the Browne Report (2010) was announced for commencement in 2013. Not only did these reforms triple tuition fees but it was determined that no public money at all would be available for the support of undergraduate teaching other than science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects, underscoring the prevailing view that the social sciences and the humanities are of lesser value based on their relative income-earning potential through knowledge transfer. While Australia had not gone so far at the time of writing (2014), the UK example does not portend well for the future funding of the social sciences and the humanities in Australia, given the similarities in higher education policy. Indeed, it is already the case that some social science disciplines receive a very low rate of support from the Australian government. Law, for example, receives approximately 15 per cent of the cost of a government-funded place.

It is apparent, therefore, that the user-pays philosophy has paved the way for the ultimate full-scale privatisation of higher education (Thornton 2012). Commodification has not only enabled the state to slough off responsibility for a significant proportion of the cost of higher education and make rapid progress towards realising its goal of becoming a new knowledge economy, but it has also enabled public coffers to be significantly augmented. For example, by 2004, the proportion of full fee-paying international students had increased from four per cent (pre-Dawkins) to 24 per cent of all university students in Australia (Corden 2005, 8). As a result, higher education quickly became the third-largest export 'industry', worth billions of dollars per year. Australia now vies with the UK, the US and France for the lion's share of the international market in educational services. However, to sustain the new 'industry' and to ensure that it remained profitable, it needed to be closely regulated, despite the prevalence of free-market discourse.

'Moscow on the Molonglo' is the witty sub-title of an article by economist Max Corden (2005), which captures a sense of the higher education scheme in Australia, with Moscow signifying the scheme's high degree of regulation and Molonglo, the small river in Canberra, signifying the key role played by the federal government in determining what leeways, if any, might be allowed to universities. Universities were encouraged to accept prevailing policies and pursue specified courses of action, not so much as a result of punitive Kremlin-like edicts but through positive inducements (Corden 2005, 12). While there has been a *laissez-faire* approach towards course offerings, determined largely

by consumer demand (with the exception of medicine), higher education policy is marked by increasing government regulation. The Tertiary Education Qualifications and Standards Agency (TEQSA), for example, is designed to exercise a homogenising effect on all degree courses. In addition, a plethora of auditing regimes has been established at the national level to guard against risk, all of which demand transparency and accountability. Thus, it is somewhat ironic that as government funding has decreased, universities have been subjected to increasing oversight and control – hence, more Moscow than Molonglo.

The new forms of governance have also changed the relationship between individual academics and the university. These forms of governmentality (Foucault 1991 [1978]; Rose 1999) have been implemented to ensure that academics and students are not only managed – but are also expected to manage themselves – in order to pursue state ends in terms of productivity, efficiency and relevance. The more pronounced the degree of disinvestment in higher education, the more insistent is the pressure on institutions – and individual academics – to pursue an entrepreneurial path. Indeed, enterprise, or entrepreneurialism, has been described as the ‘third mission’ or ‘third stream’ activity of the neoliberal university, along with teaching and research (Shore and McLauchlan 2012). A close liaison between academic researchers and industry has been effected through government funding initiatives, such as Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage Grants, in order to encourage applied and ‘relevant’ research, but the pressure from industry partners to shape outcomes can be problematic. The veneer of equal treatment between ‘pure research’ and applied funding regimes occludes the way applied research has contributed to a dilution of independent, critical and theoretical research (Tombs and Whyte 2003, 207).

Perhaps of even more significance is the way such research policies have subtly contributed to the inversion of the meanings of public and private to reflect the ideology of the market turn. This is illustrated by an insightful ethnographic study of the discourse of entrepreneurialism and commercialism at the University of Auckland conducted by Cris Shore and Laura McLauchlan (2012). They show how profit arising from private investment and knowledge transfer has come to signify public good in relation to knowledge production within the university community. The changed discourse has effectively silenced dissent and normalised commodification. The fostering of innovators and entrepreneurs also suggests a preference for ‘scientists, technicians and business people rather than social scientists or those trained in the humanities’ (Shore and McLauchlan 2012, 281). More insidiously, it shows how neoliberalism has been able to assert itself as the common sense view of the world (Harvey 2005, 3), thereby resisting critique.

Corporatisation and competition have inevitably brought in their wake a more distinct hierarchisation of universities. Rarely encountered prior to the turn of the century, league tables and rankings now animate vice-chancellors and university managers everywhere in the worldwide ‘battle for excellence’ (Hazelkorn 2011, 4). While undergraduate students are regarded as the major source of regular income for most universities, research is what counts for the Go8 (Group of Eight) research-intensive universities and those aspiring to join their ranks. On its face, the paradox to be confronted is that while excellence in social science and humanities research is lauded, overall funding has been reduced in favour of areas perceived to have greater use value in the market, such as technoscience, thereby entrenching the historic divisions and tensions between the ‘two cultures’.

Wrestling with the social

Given the diffidence about the social sciences, one might then ask, what is distinctive about this cluster of disciplines vis-à-vis the humanities and the sciences? Whether ‘social science’ appears in the singular or the plural, it is an amorphous concept encompassing the study of society, culture and the state. Although such studies may be conducted from the perspective of a single discipline, it is thought that they generally function better in combination than separately (Brewer 2013, 10). The boundaries between disciplines are nevertheless often impermeable because of traditional claims to distinctiveness, university structures and the competition for resources, as well as government funding and reporting requirements. The current research assessment exercise, Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA), for example, is primarily discipline-based, which inhibits interdisciplinary research, despite the rhetoric.

There is nevertheless continuing ambivalence about the status of the social sciences. The ‘two cultures’ model of the university, famously articulated by CP Snow (1964), illustrates the science/humanities dualism that discounts the social sciences. After being trenchantly attacked, however, Snow (1964, 71) conceded that a third culture would eventually come about. Jerome Kagan (2009) was one who took up the challenge, arguing that the premises, analytic tools and concepts of the three cultures represent ‘language communities that impose distinct meaning networks’ (2009, 6). Despite attempts of this kind to establish the uniqueness of the social sciences, there nevertheless seems to have been something of a reversion to the two-cultures model, possibly boosted by conservative reactions to postmodernism, which was embraced by academics in both the humanities and the social sciences, but not the sciences. Whether such factors contributed to a conflation between the humanities and the social

sciences in the popular imagination or not is impossible to say, but it is apparent that the distinction between the humanities and the social sciences is weakening (Macintyre 2010, 298).

In any case, it is difficult to categorise entire disciplines schematically, as they all rely on a range of techniques and theories. The scholarly shift away from positivism, empiricism and behaviourism in favour of the subjectivity and ambiguity of epistemological standpoints has further blurred the distinction. Furthermore, disciplines such as history and philosophy are included in the cluster of disciplines recognised by both the Academy of the Humanities and the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia. Similarly, disciplines such as law are sometimes grouped with the humanities, sometimes with the social sciences, sometimes in a separate category with 'the professions' and sometimes as a discrete discipline altogether, a point that highlights the futility of attempts to develop a precise taxonomy.

It is apparent that the social sciences thrived under social liberalism in the Australia of the 1960s and 1970s. Their fortunes received a boost with the establishment of the 'gumtree universities', viz. Flinders, Griffith, La Trobe, Macquarie and Murdoch (Marginson and Considine 2000), which accorded special attention to the study of society and culture, often through a multidisciplinary lens. Like the humanities, however, they suffered a decline in status with the neoliberal turn and were subjected to faculty closures and mergers.

Macintyre suggests that it was the funding formula for research policy under the Howard government that entrenched the status of the social sciences as 'the poor relation' (2010, 330), when large sums were injected into science and technology as the primary sources of innovation. As suggested, the social sciences, like the humanities, do not engage in techno-scientific research and there is little expectation of patents and commercialisation. Furthermore, the methodologies of audit, such as bibliometrics, which are designed to render 'excellence' calculable, favour the physical, life and medical sciences (Hazelkorn 2011, 71).

Nevertheless, it would seem to be the political rather than the methodological role of the social sciences that is primarily responsible for the change of status in the contemporary climate. The shift from a focus on civil society and citizenship to the market, entrepreneurialism and consumerism marks the transition from social liberalism to neoliberalism. The transition has been such that Rose (1999, 100) and other theorists refer to the 'death of the social'. Indeed, it would appear that it is the social in the social sciences that is not only resistant to containment within a classificatory box, it is a cause of distrust. Positivist and technocratic methodologies are therefore preferred as they suppress both the social and the critical and are less likely to expose the dark underside of wealth maximisation

policies, including those emanating from the corporatisation of the university. Attempts to excise the socio-legal from the teaching of law aptly illustrates the point (Baron 2013; Thornton 2006). Thus, the nub of the explanation as to why some social science research has fallen out of favour is because of its critical role, particularly in regard to government policy (Sawer 2004; Sawer and Hindess 2004; cf. Brewer 2013, 9), just as the fear of the humanities has caused them to be attacked (Nussbaum 2010, 23).

One of the traditional aims of the public university has been to carry out the role of ‘critic and conscience of society’, a role that is distinctively associated with the social sciences and the humanities (cf. Small 2013, 137). Although none of the Australian university Acts of Incorporation advert to this crucial role of critic and conscience, it is explicit in the New Zealand legislation (Education Act 1989 (NZ), s 4(a)(v)). The nearest any of the Australian Acts come to articulating such an aim is a provision included in an amendment to the Victorian Acts in 2003 (University Acts (Amendment) Act 2003 (Vic), s 3(b) et seq), which specifies that universities should promote ‘critical enquiry within the university and in the general community’. Somewhat ironically, this provision was added only after universities had been thoroughly corporatised (Thornton 2012, 194). Nevertheless, it needs to be kept in mind that ‘critical enquiry’ is an express legislative aim; it is not merely a Newmanite ideal.

The critic and conscience role of the social sciences is comparable to that of the gadfly invoked by Socrates (Plato 30d–31a). The allusion captures the crucial but sometimes discomfiting role of one who critiques prevailing values thought to be contrary to the best interests of society. Unsurprisingly, the critic and conscience role has become increasingly unpopular in a neoliberal climate in the context of the corporatised university and beyond, where managerial deference rather than academic freedom is the order of the day, despite a renewed focus on freedom-of-speech rhetoric in public discourse.¹

A notorious example of an attempt by government to inhibit the critic and conscience role occurred in 2004–05 when the then Higher Education Minister, Dr Brendan Nelson, vetoed a number of ARC grants in the humanities and social science that involved research on gender, sexuality and green politics. Dr Nelson set up a scrutiny committee of ‘supremely unqualified people’ (Peter Doherty, Nobel Prize winner, quoted in Bonnell 2014, 21) to determine whether

¹ Attorney-General’s Department (Australian Government, *Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression*. Retrieved 2 October 2014, from www.ag.gov.au/RightsAndProtections/HumanRights/PublicSectorGuidanceSheets/Pages/Righttofreedomofopinionandexpression.aspx). A ‘Freedom Commissioner’ was appointed to the Australian Human Rights Commission in 2014. Retrieved 2 October 2014, from www.humanrights.gov.au/about/commissioners/human-rights-commissioner-mr-tim-wilson.

a list of humanities and social science projects would deliver ‘national benefit’. The academic community was incensed with this overt interference as the projects had already been subjected to peer review.

Interventions of the Nelson kind are nevertheless so overt that they are quickly exposed. More invidious is the routine policing of critical research and teaching under the now familiar rubrics of excellence, competitiveness and standardisation. It is these practices, normalised within the ostensibly rational auditing processes of the neoliberal university, which are rapidly eroding academic freedom.

It would therefore appear that the critic and conscience role has become more vexed and elusive at the very moment society is most in need of it. While there is undoubtedly an absence of unanimity as to the diagnosis of the malaise within the contemporary university, let alone the way forward, the social sciences can bring their critical skills to bear in theorising and critiquing the challenge to the public good in order to inform public debate, as the contributors to this collection set out to do.

The collection

The wide range of disciplines represented in this collection, viz. economics, education, history, law, philosophy, political science, sociology and cultural studies, encompass a range of perspectives that conveys something of the rich tapestry of the social sciences. The essays reflect a range of methodologies and standpoints, drawing on the experiences of both managers and the managed in the neoliberal university. The contributors bring their disciplinary insights to bear in placing the corporatised university under the microscope, as well as reflexively examining the impact of the market and competition policy on the student experience and academic life.

A focus on the changing nature of academics as new knowledge workers, students as citizen-consumers and the academy itself as a commodified space has far-reaching ramifications for the nature of society, including the future of democracy. While all the contributors may not imagine themselves as Socratic gadflies, they have relentlessly pursued the critic and conscience role in the best tradition of the social sciences.

Part I: Theorising the modern university

1. *Hannah Forsyth* sets the scene by historicising the university with particular regard to the Australian context. She presents a view that does not mythologise the pre-Dawkins era as a ‘golden age’, a tendency that

may emerge or appear to emerge as a corollary of focusing on the harsh post-1988 reforms. With careful regard to archival material, Forsyth shows how academics had in fact moved away from the notion of the idealised 'disinterested scholar' much earlier in the 20th century. Forsyth argues that academics had already become self-confessed interested parties, which has had significant consequences for the characterisation of the public interest.

2. In developing a critical theory of the modern university, *Peter Beilharz* problematises the twin issues of time and technology, partly to transcend the culture of complaint presently besetting academia. The conjunction of time and technology not only encourages a propensity in favour of the 'hurried life' for which there is no 'off-switch', but it encourages the pursuit of a particular kind of knowledge. The preference is for facts and information instantaneously available at the press of a button, a phenomenon that has captivated students and impacted on teaching. The 'hurried life' and the pace of technological change pose hard questions for what universities might look like in the coming decades. However, instead of taking them for granted, their conjunction must be the focus of a critical theory of the university.
3. Philosophy has been central to the traditional 'idea of the university' and, on its face, is at odds with the prevailing culture of market rationality as it has no obvious use value but, as *Fiona Jenkins* points out, the discipline of philosophy is highly rated in terms of 'research excellence'. Nevertheless, women in philosophy fare less well than their male peers, with a dearth of women occupying senior positions, particularly in élite institutions, a gendered hierarchisation that is mapped onto philosophical scholarship. Hence, the 'hard' areas, such as epistemology and metaphysics, in which men predominate, fare significantly better than the 'soft' areas of critique and feminist theory. Jenkins argues that it is the right to judge that gives rise to status affirmation in the audit culture, which succeeds in maintaining a masculinist ordering. Seeing and hearing what one wants to is then secured by relations of power and the partiality of the social sciences within an 'excellence' paradigm. Jenkins exhorts a questioning of the mismatch between experience and theory to establish a practice of transformative criticism that contests the prevailing epistemic hegemony.

Part II: Markets, managers and mandarins

4. *Geoffrey Brennan* takes quite a different approach to those who aver that knowledge is changing as a result of marketisation, suggesting that both the focus of the 2013 workshop and this collection of essays, is misplaced. While he does not deny the incidence of change, he suggests that it has emanated from government, not the workings of the market, although the market rhetoric is undeniably present. Brennan attributes the material

changes that have occurred within universities largely to a matter of scale. It is inevitable, he suggests, that the shift to a mass system would produce a greater incidence of vocationalism. Furthermore, he avers that the 'good old days' were not necessarily so good after all, especially in view of what he claims was its tolerance of 'freeloaders'. In his conclusion, he endorses the basic Newmanite idealisation of the university as the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake which, he believes, continues to motivate academics.

5. The argument put forward in *Tony Aspromourgos'* chapter is complementary to that of Geoffrey Brennan in so far as he argues that a genuinely competitive market is not possible in the case of universities. Aspromourgos suggests that this is because universities possess information not available to consumers. Information asymmetry can have distorting effects, such as the likelihood of low-quality education driving out high-quality. Like many of the contributors to the collection, Aspromourgos is nevertheless critical of the managerialist predilections of the contemporary university, particularly its tendency to erode a civic sensibility. For example, the key-performance indicator (KPI) approach adopted by some universities leads them to compete for 'star performers' and pay salary supplements, which cause academics to be beholden to managers. Aspromourgos identifies the global university rankings as the most pernicious KPI of all.
6. In problematising the 'public university', *Kanishka Jayasuriya* observes how the concept of 'public' changes according to time and circumstance. Massification, constraints on funding, the growing role of rankings, especially in research, and the demands of the post-industrial service-based economy have all played a role in inducing changes to higher education. Jayasuriya endeavours to make sense of the way the public university relates to governance changes in the state. He argues that market citizenship has not hollowed out the public university, but has reconstituted it through new patterns of regulatory governance that underline different notions of 'publicness'.
7. In presenting an overview of reforms that have occurred in the 21st century in sometimes less-than-propitious circumstances, *Glenn Withers* shows that higher education, like many endeavours, comprises a mixture of public and private variables. He argues that the reforms, emanating from both Liberal and Labor government policy, have maintained 'the market, mandarin and management momentum' at the expense of collegiality. In looking to the future, Withers cautions against overuse of the word 'university', as it is a concept that should be restricted to institutions with a public benefit role. He believes that this should include private institutions, but not those of a for-profit nature.

Part III: Education for the ‘real world’

8. Like the authors in Part II, *Nigel Palmer* problematises the idea of the marketisation of the modern university but focuses specifically on what he terms the ‘university–student transaction’. The role played by governments in reshaping higher education with the use of market-like mechanisms produces ambiguous and contradictory responses, particularly on the part of university managers. Students are savvy consumers who are getting more than knowledge in exchange for fees. While they are attracted by the academic reputation of a university, the branding of a university is likely to stress other aspects of the student experience for marketing purposes. Despite the current enthusiasm for measuring academic activity, the precise nature of the student experience is becoming obscure. Palmer nevertheless suggests that students are becoming more sophisticated, which requires universities to pay attention as to how they engage with the market.
9. *Bruce Lindsay* argues that as students have become consumers or bearers of cognitive capital, they are key figures in the economic optimisation of knowledge. Accordingly, the management of students has become a central plank of the governance of the university. Misconduct and unsatisfactory progress are the examples that Lindsay highlights as these are both areas in which new forms of governance have been formalised and standardised according to legal models. The technologies involved represent not only a break with the informal and paternalistic approaches of the past, but they also facilitate a greater degree of surveillance over students who are being prepared for strategic roles in the contemporary labour market. The possibility of effectively taking issue with this new reality poses an acute challenge in a neoliberal climate.
10. *Margaret Thornton* and *Lucinda Shannon*, through a study of law school websites, show how the market is exercising a negative effect on legal education. They argue that the new marketised framework positions students as customers who are encouraged to choose the most attractive educational ‘product’. Thornton and Shannon show how choice is constructed with the aid of ‘branding’. While sameness could be said to be a characteristic of legal education, choice requires an element of difference. In presenting themselves to fickle customers as the means of realising a bright future filled with excitement and glamour, law schools play down the civic role of legal education. Rather than promoting a commitment to critical thinking and social justice, Thornton and Shannon argue, law school marketing encourages consumerism as the ultimate realisation of the good life.

Part IV: Conditions of knowledge production

11. *Jill Blackmore* is concerned to show how the corporatised university is essentially a gendered phenomenon. Its characteristics of managerialism, marketisation and privatisation have moved to a new phase with globalisation. She argues that the increasing number of women in the academy obscures the gender imperative associated with managerialism. The hard sciences are viewed as more productive than the humanities and the social sciences, the disciplines where women predominate, but it is from the masculinised hard sciences that university research leaders tend to be selected. In addition, factors such as the tendency to unbundle research and teaching through the creation of increasing numbers of teaching-only and casualised positions are exerting a disproportionately gendered impact. The result is leading not only to a de-professionalisation of academic work but to a re-masculinisation of the academy.
12. *Jenny Corbett, Andrew MacIntyre and Inger Mewburn* are not convinced of the negative effects of managerialism upon research. They suggest that critics of the contemporary university tend to compare it with an imaginary golden age, although universities have always been subject to the prescripts of the state or church that funded them. They also suggest that critics are unlikely to have had experience of management themselves. More fundamentally, they evince a scepticism about the role of critique itself, particularly as it appears to have had little discernible effect. In contrast, Corbett et al. seek to put a positive spin on the new modes of academic practice and point to the plethora of new opportunities arising from multiple funding sources. They suggest that new initiatives, such as crowd-funding, could overcome the possibility of improper influence by a funder. While casualisation is challenging for those not in full-time employment, Corbett et al. argue that developments in technology can be used productively.

Part V: Telling it how it is

13. *Diane Kirkby and Kerreen Reiger* argue that trust and relational networking are central to productive academic workplaces and reveal what happens when these values are absent in the context of a case study of organisational change involving a faculty of humanities and social sciences. The authors elaborate upon the new culture of managerialism that has emerged from the corporatised top-down university in which collegiality has declined and academics are treated not only disrespectfully but are regarded as 'the problem'. Kirkby and Reiger report how they conducted interviews and engaged in other forms of interaction with approximately 50 members of staff at La Trobe University to highlight the 'dark side' of managerialism, revealing

how the proposed changes and their implementation induced trauma, grief and depression. The authors also show how the new managerialism privileges masculinity, for the process of change disproportionately impacted on female staff, as well as feminised areas of the curriculum. The La Trobe experience graphically highlights the contemporary challenge for the social sciences, underscoring the way social science scholars are deemed not to have use-value in the corporatised academy.

14. Continuing the critique of managerialism in the contemporary academy, *Judith Bessant* recounts her own gruelling experience as an academic who challenged not only the bullying and harassment of her immediate supervisor but that of senior university managers, which led to her dismissal on spurious grounds. With the support of the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU), the matter was pursued and successfully resolved in the Federal Court where Bessant's reinstatement was ordered. She draws attention not only to the failings of management in 'dark times', but the self-silencing by colleagues that such times induce. Bessant argues that while 'speaking truth to power' is essential for academic integrity, effective challenge is possible only with collective support. As the evisceration of collegiality is a marked characteristic of the managerialist university, reclaiming it poses a major challenge.

Part VI: University futures?

15. *Jane Kenway, Rebecca Boden and Johannah Fahey* acknowledge the injurious impact of neoliberalism on academic life but, rather than dwell on the despair it induces, they set out to seek a more positive message to make 'hope possible'. They argue that hope can be a subversive force and consider some resources that enable universities to be reconceptualised in other than neoliberal terms. Kenway, Boden and Fahey recount several notable examples of insurgent intellectuals creating spaces of hope through imaginative teaching and research. They also recount several instances of collective activism, involving both staff and students who have campaigned against restructuring and job cuts. As activism may provoke violent reprisals, the participants' bravery must be regarded as a source of inspiration and optimism.

This text is taken from *Through a Glass Darkly: The Social Sciences
Look at the Neoliberal University*, edited by Margaret Thornton,
first published 2014, this version 2015 by ANU Press,
The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.