

# **University Reform in Global Times: Opportunities and Challenges**

Robert A. Rhoads  
Professor

Graduate School of Education and Information Studies  
UCLA  
3141 Moore Hall, Box # 951521  
Los Angeles, CA. 90095-1521  
E-Mail: rhoads@ucla.edu  
Phone: 310-794-4243  
FAX: 310-206-6293

Paper published in *Chung Cheng Educational Studies*, vol. 5 (2006), pp. 1-24 (initially presented at the “Globalization in Higher Education Conference” at National Chung Cheng University, Chia-Yi, Taiwan, November 2005).

May 2006

# **University Reform in Global Times: Opportunities and Challenges**

**Robert A. Rhoads**  
**UCLA**

## **I. Establishing the Global Context of Higher Education**

There are many interesting things going on within the realm of higher education these days. To some extent, the changes we see in higher education in general and at universities in particular are unprecedented. And many of these changes are deeply implicated by a variety of social processes that are global in character. For example, a few years ago the United Nations announced that it was opening World Trade University. The university was to be based in Canada and would offer programs in international banking, trade law, and other areas of study useful to the advance of global trade. Within my own country, universities such as Michigan State University and Pennsylvania State University opened Internet-based versions of themselves, respectively named “Virtual University” and “World University.” In Egypt, not so long ago, a French university opened its doors with the clear objective of challenging the dominance of English as the language of international business. Moreover, the World Trade Organization, through initiatives such as GATS—the General Agreement on Trade and Services—has increasingly sought to regulate educational services at a global level, including the import and export of students. Finally, around the world we witness a broad movement involving the implementation of tuition and fees where none existed previously, or the elevation of tuition and fees in cases where such requirements were already in place. In several debt-riddled countries, including Argentina and Mexico, tuition increases have

been pushed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as part of structural adjustment programs aimed at privatizing numerous public services. From the IMF's perspective, higher education is simply one more public enterprise likely to benefit from a stiff dose of privatization (Rhoads 2003).

Additionally, in an analysis of mission statements from universities throughout the world, global themes tend to dominate the discourse (Rhoads and Szelényi forthcoming). In fact, it is hard to find a university website these days that doesn't in some way address the issue of increased international integration and the emergence of a so-called "global community." For example, I examined the websites of many universities around the world and noted the following messages (the underlined text represents my emphasis). The University of Melbourne in Australia seeks to prepare students "to contribute effectively to their communities wherever in the world they choose to live and work." The University of Guadalajara in Mexico seeks to foster students' holistic development, including increased tolerance and "the love of country and humanity." Similarly, the University of Botswana seeks to "advance the intellectual and human resource capacity of the nation and the international community." Kyoto University in Japan "welcomes students from all over the world who aspire to learn and to foster their interest in taking an active part in international society."

Furthermore, many university officials are quite explicit in connecting their institutions to a global vision. According to Tokyo University's President, Komiyama Hiroshi ("Message from the President"), his university aims to become the "World's Tokyo University" and strives to create "an institution that contributes to the benefit of all human society." He further explains, "The age of nations is coming to an end, and global

competition has inspired a growing awareness of the need for a collective human society.” The President of New York University, John Sexton (“Message from the President”), also claims “global university” status: “We have expanded our focus from New York, the world’s capital city, to become a truly global university, with significant New York University Centers around the world.”

I want to use the preceding examples and others that follow to raise some fundamental questions about universities in a global age. I also want to use the international context of today’s universities to raise important questions about just what “university reform” means in today’s environment. I hope to demonstrate that the global conditions of contemporary universities pose numerous opportunities and challenges, many of which are only now unfolding.

## **II. Reform and Globalization Conceptualized**

With the preceding in mind, I want to begin by making some rather complex terms as clear as possible: terms such as “reform” and “globalization” in particular. I think it is somewhat self-evident that the way in which we conceptualize these terms shapes to a certain extent conclusions that may be drawn.

Let me begin the conversation with the concept of “reform,” and, in particular, “university reform.” Here, I call upon the work of Atilio Boron (2006), a political economist living and working in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Boron notes that within Western political tradition the word “reform” has a clear progressive and sometimes democratic meaning, often describing actions intended to enhance the social or economic conditions of the people of a given society. Boron also points out that “reform” once was

closely associated with the broad effort to restructure Christianity, and involved “the exaltation of the capacity” of regular citizens to relate to God “without the mediation of the priests” (p. 143). Once again the idea of reform was seen to be progressive in nature and democratic in its intent. Finally, a third example offered by Boron is that of the Western Enlightenment movement and its progressive ambition to liberate human thinking, making knowledge and one’s participation in the development of knowledge potentially more inclusive. Essentially, knowledge was to be disconnected from the exclusivity of aristocracy. Thus, we can conclude from Boron’s work that the concept of reform, as applied to the university context, should in some way lead to an expansion of opportunities and increased access to knowledge and its development. If restructuring universities and higher education systems leads in the opposite direction—that is, the changes actually limit opportunity and access—then such changes ought to be defined as “regressive” in nature, and not as reformist.

In terms of the word “globalization,” let me first stress that globalization is not a recent phenomenon. The influence of individuals and groups on others has steadily increased throughout human history, reaching a point some five hundred years ago that could reasonably be described as “global” in nature. Indeed, most scholars of globalization locate its origins in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when “a dense pattern of global interconnections began to emerge with the initial expansion of the world economy and the rise of the modern state” (Held, 1990, p. 192). As the means of transportation steadily advanced over time, so did the power of one society to influence another. This was becoming increasingly evident with the rise of the great world powers and their ability to dominate parts of nearly every region of the world. Thus, it is the 16<sup>th</sup> century

arguably that gave rise to globalization, for this period in time marked the rise of the great navies, global shipping and trade industries, extensive trans-oceanic migration, and, of course, expansive colonization.

But a second phase of globalization is also identified and dated to around the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, following World War II. This more up-to-date conception of globalization is rooted in much more than the idea of increased physical and cultural contact among nations and societies. Indeed, the physical is no longer a necessity of extensive transnational and multinational contact, what with the Internet, e-mail, and cheaper telecommunications systems in place. This more contemporary notion of globalization has been defined by Anthony Giddens, in *The Consequences of Modernity*, as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (1990, p. 64). Similarly, David Held (1991) described globalization as a reduction of time and space such that events in one part of the world have the potential to influence events in another part of the world, sometimes almost simultaneously. This phase of globalization typically is that to which most social theorists point when they discuss the rise of international, transnational, and multinational organizations, advances in technology and information sciences, the emergence of a worldwide division of labor, and the increase in human mobility through improved and more affordable transportation. Furthermore, I see these changes primarily driven by the steady march of capitalism, to the extent that by the early 1980s one might realistically speak of “global capitalism.” Thus, in my discussion of university reform in a global era, capitalism, and more particularly, global capitalism, is front and center.

### III. Five Manifestations of Globalization

In seeking to convey a somewhat unified understanding of globalization, I often find myself spinning in circles. In preparing this paper I came to a somewhat familiar position by now: That globalization is far too complex to present in a simple formulaic manner. What has become increasingly obvious to me, and to other social theorists, is that there are multiple manifestations of globalization interacting simultaneously in a fairly convoluted fashion—some in fact use the term “globalizations” or “multiple globalizations” to convey this idea. And yet, the many forms of globalization are all deeply affected by the dynamics of international relations of the past few years, and by implication, influence the role of universities in serving citizens, as well as the local, national, and international settings in which they exist. Consequently, instead of presenting one notion of globalization, I want to highlight five primary manifestations that stand out in today’s context. And here I draw from the recently published book by myself and Carlos Alberto Torres (2006)—*The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*. Certainly, there are other manifestations of globalization, but these five seem most relevant to an up-to-date discussion of university reform.

***Globalization from Above.*** One form of globalization, often seen as “globalization from above,” is framed by an ideology that may be described as *neoliberalism*. Neoliberals call for an opening of national borders for the purpose of increased commodity and capital exchange, the creation of multiple regional markets, the elevation of free markets over state-controlled markets and interventions, the proliferation of fast-paced economic and financial transactions, and the presence of

governing systems/networks other than nation-states (Castells 1997; Stiglitz 2002; Stromquist 2002; Torres 1998; Torres and Rhoads 2006). Neoliberalism seeks to privatize virtually every process or service that can possibly be turned over to private capital (Apple 2000; Chomsky 1998; Giroux 2002). “Selective deregulation” and “privatization” are battle cries of this version of globalization.

***Globalization from Below.*** Another form of globalization represents the antithesis of the first. This form of globalization is often described as “globalization from below,” or “anti-globalization,” which I see as a misnomer, given that the various groups and movements aimed at challenging neoliberal versions of globalization are not opposed to increased international integration in general. Globalization from below is largely manifested in individuals, institutions, and social movements actively opposed to that which is perceived as corporate globalism (Kellner 2000). For these individuals and groups, “no globalization without representation” is the motto.

***Cultural Globalization.*** A third form of globalization is represented by the movement and exchange of people and ideas and their subsequent influence on culture, and has been described as “cultural globalization.” Now, it is certainly true that the globalization of people and ideas dates back to an earlier time, when the first great navies and shipping industries emerged. But during the last part of the twentieth century we saw an escalation of international exchange such that now it is quite common to speak of the internationalization of cultures and societies. There is a “hybridization” of the world to some extent (Said 1993), and technology is playing a central role in such processes, as transportation and communication technologies increasingly are re-shaping the world—

the computing industry and the Internet come to mind especially. Clearly, cultural hybridity is the theme of this manifestation of globalization.

***Globalization of Human Rights.*** A fourth theme emerges from increased international integration and pertains more to rights than to markets: the globalization of human rights. With the growing ideology of human rights taking hold of international systems and international law, many traditional practices endemic to the fabric of particular societies or cultures—from religious practices to esoteric practices—now are being called into question, challenged, forbidden, or even outlawed. Advancement of cosmopolitan democracies and forms of global citizenship are the themes of this version of globalization.

***Globalization of Violence of a Massive Scale.*** Finally, there is a fifth manifestation of globalization that I consider. This form extends beyond markets, and to some extent is against human rights. Here, I speak of the globalization of terrorism and the international war against terrorism (I actually prefer the phrase the “globalization of violence of a massive scale,” because of difficulties defining “terrorism” and “terrorists,” a point I return to shortly). This form of globalization has become symbolized to a large extent by the events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent reaction of the United States. The U.S. response has been militaristic in nature, resulting in two coalition wars against Muslim regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq. And yet, the overall theme of this process was not only its militaristic nature, but also the emphasis on security and the control of borders, people, capital, and commodities—that is, the reverse of open markets and high-paced commodity exchanges. This trend has had quite a negative impact on scholarly exchange, especially in the United States, where visa problems have deterred

many foreign students and scholars. “Security as a precondition of freedom” is the stated theme of this form of globalization. Not surprisingly, the state’s nemesis, “privatized violence of a massive scale” (defined by states such as the United States as “terrorism”), endorses the motto that “only chaos will bring about freedom.” The complexities here in part center upon who are the “terrorists” and who are the “anti-terrorists.” The answer to this question, of course, depends on one’s perspective and suggests a somewhat relativistic conception of “terrorism”: Terrorism is, as Noam Chomsky points out, what “they carry out against us” (2006, p. 44). Even the most casual observer recognizes that each side defines its opposition as engaging in terrorism; despite this conundrum, global violence of a massive scale ensues and in the end shapes all of our lives in counter-productive ways.

Clearly, globalization may be characterized by multiplicity and contradictions, with deep-rooted historical causes, and, if one thinks of the tenets of human rights, for instance, a historical process difficult to reverse or even confront. Let me now explore in the remainder of my talk how these various manifestations of globalization are shaping university reform.

#### **IV. University Reform: Opportunities and Challenges**

Keeping in mind the five manifestations of globalization, as well as a particular conception of reform outlined earlier, what opportunities and challenges does the present-day global context pose for universities throughout the world? In addressing this question I want to pay particular attention to global capitalism and its growing influence on universities.

My earlier discussion of *globalization from above* is grounded in a particular view of world economics that essentially envisions markets replacing the regulating role of the nation-state. Many have come to describe this philosophy as “neoliberalism,” but it is really rooted in a conservative and neoconservative view of the world (Apple 2000), fairly consistent with classical capitalist theory as spelled out by Adam Smith (1937) in *The Wealth of Nations*. The term “neoliberalism” more or less derives from the idea of the “liberalization” or “new liberalization” of global trade, a position most pointedly advanced by the Reagan and Thatcher regimes of the 1980s. But regardless of the language or terms used we must recognize that there are powerful forces throughout the world that seek to limit the role of government, while elevating the role of the free market as an adjudicating force in governing social relations. This poses numerous opportunities and challenges for university reform—especially as these issues relate to public and national universities.

***Deregulation.*** First, there is a movement by nation-states to de-regulate economic mechanisms and free up organizations and individuals to more easily engage in entrepreneurial activity. In some national contexts, such as the People’s Republic of China (PRC), the deregulation of higher education is discussed in terms of “decentralization.” As Ka Ho Mok (2002) points out, the Chinese Communist Party has acknowledged “that over-centralization and stringent rules. . . kill the initiatives and enthusiasm of local educational institutions” (p. 261). Hence, the CCP has called for reform aimed at decentralizing the nation’s higher education sector by “devolving decision-making power from the central government to individual higher education institutions. . . . [Consequently], the state has allowed more autonomy and flexibility to

local governments and educationalists in directing the course of educational development” (p. 261).

In the case of the PRC, decentralization appears as part of a larger project aimed at shifting the country from a government controlled economy to a socialist market economy. Translated to the higher education arena, universities throughout China are increasingly operating in an environment in which they are freer to make their own economic choices, and, in fact, with reduced funding from the national government seem to have no other alternative. But this process is complex and often too slow for neoliberals in control of the World Trade Organization, the IMF, and the World Bank. They, of course, would prefer to see China embark on a full-fledged capitalist project, dropping the “socialist” influences from its economic policies.

In many Western countries the expansion of deregulation is more a matter of escalating the role of entrepreneurialism. This is especially the case within the public university sector, where deregulation has been accompanied by decreased state support and has produced forms of economic entrepreneurialism that have been described by some scholars as “academic capitalism”—a situation in which the primary objective of the university increasingly revolves around the generation of revenue and not necessarily teaching and learning (Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades 2004). I will say more about the role and prominence of academic capitalism later.

Clearly, the deregulation of higher education is both an opportunity and a challenge. When it is accompanied by high levels of state financial support, then deregulation presents universities with the opportunity to expand programs and access through their own innovative means. However, when deregulation is accompanied by

decreases in state support—the most common scenario—then universities are seemingly forced to become entrepreneurial institutions and in many cases follow a path of increasing reliance on tuition and fees. This pattern, of course, results in decreased access for the poor, working class, and in some countries, for the lower-middle class. In this scenario, and keeping in mind Boron’s definition of reform, it is hard to see such changes as progressive or reformist in nature. Indeed, I would describe these sorts of changes as regressive and aristocratic.

***Privatization.*** A second way in which global capitalism is shaping university reform revolves around privatization. The privatization movement is closely packaged with deregulation and declining state support. In some sense, deregulation and a reduction in support are the means for achieving a specific end, which is privatization. In a broader philosophical sense, this trend represents private interests assuming priority over the broader social good—essentially speaking, capitalism wins out over socialism.

The deregulation of higher education has made “for-profit” and private colleges and universities increasingly viable. In the United States, for example, this trend is less noticeable in the private sector, but clearly evident in the area of “for-profit” higher education, where institutions such as the University of Phoenix quite successfully have carved out their own niche by stressing practical and vocational education over some of the more esoteric forms of learning commonly found at many U.S. universities. In countries such as the People’s Republic of China, the private sector has emerged to help meet the incredible demands of a massive population, as the nation increasingly seeks to build a workforce capable of competing in a global market place. However, and as a consequence of deregulation, the quality of private colleges and universities, as well as

the for-profits, ranges quite dramatically. In Brazil, for example, the private sector is completely inferior to public universities. In contrast, many of the private universities in the United States are considered among the top universities in the world—Harvard, Stanford, and Yale come to mind. But these institutions have long histories and are less a product of the most recent wave of global changes and the increasing force of global capitalism. Nonetheless, the trend toward declining state support for universities has hurt these institutions far less than institutions such as UCLA, UC Berkeley, Pennsylvania State University, and Michigan State University, all of which are still dependent to a large extent on the state.

Privatization is advanced hand-in-hand with increased entrepreneurialism, especially in the most developed countries, as universities seek to expand their revenue through a variety of profit-seeking endeavors, including satellite campuses and extension programs around the world. Here too the quality of such international undertakings often comes under question, as was evident recently when a top Australian official raised concerns about “rogue” education providers taking advantage of student interest in foreign study (Cohen 2005). Some have raised questions about the quality of the educational experience Western institutions offer to students from China and India specifically. One might ask—To what degree are these international programs legitimate educational enterprises, or are they severely compromised and simply trying to capitalize on the desire of Chinese or Indian students to study abroad?

Additionally, many universities in the wealthiest countries are actively involved in shaping the nature of higher education in less developed countries, as is the case with a program funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in

which U.S. colleges and universities received funds to assist in the development of Iraqi higher education (Del Castillo 2003b). Similarly, U.S. officials are actively involved in developing a stronger private higher education sector in Afghanistan (Del Castillo 2003a). In these latter two instances, we see clear connections between neoliberalism and the U.S.-led war on global terrorism, with two countries identified by U.S. officials to be breeding grounds for terrorism on the receiving end of heavy doses of “American-style” higher education. Of course, privatization is also driving research and development agendas at universities, especially in the United States, where the quest to acquire funds for research and development can be described as “insatiable,” if not “blood thirsty”—especially given the connections to the government’s military spending.

Privatization also is leading to the implementation of or increases in tuition and fees, as many public universities shift to user-fees as major sources of funding. In other words, privatization is pushing universities away from the ideal of increased access for low-income groups and is instead making a university education more exclusive. This aspect of the influence of global capitalism meets head on against two significant manifestations of globalization: the globalization of human rights and globalization from below. With regard to the globalization of human rights, and here I think of the cases of Argentina and Mexico, many activists, students, and professors argue that higher education ought to be an essential right for all people of a given society. Indeed, in both Argentina and Mexico long-standing social contracts exist that suggest that their national universities—the University of Buenos Aires and the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Rhoads 2003; Rhoads and Mina 2001)—ought to be accessible to even those citizens with the most modest of means. Thus, many in these countries have protested

vehemently against the charging or raising of fees. Additionally, globalization from below, in the form of social movements that have emerged to challenge neoliberalism, also work in conjunction with human rights movements to limit the privatization of universities. This was most apparent when various factions representing the University of Buenos Aires worked hand-in-hand with community-led movements, spawning Argentina's grassroots rebellion (against structural adjustment policies advanced by the IMF), and essentially posing a successful challenge to neoliberalism. Hence, privatization, at least in the realm of tuition and fee increases, has not gone unchecked.

Thus, when it comes to privatization, university reform faces many opportunities and challenges. Most notably, while universities around the world may be freer to engage in entrepreneurialism, they often do so in the face of declining state support. A common by-product of declining support are increased costs that in turn are passed on to users—namely the students who attend our institutions. Thus, for those of us committed to true university reform, passing declining state support on to users is essentially regressive in nature. And so one of the major challenges universities face today is controlling costs and finding ways to maintain an affordable education. They also need to do a better job of public relations—that is, universities must make clear the contributions they make to society, so that legislative decision-makers are not so quick to eliminate state support at the first sign of economic crisis. In my own country, one solution to declining support for higher education is linked to the country's on-going investment in its military industrial complex. Here, globalization-from-below movements, self-described as “bombs for books,” have worked to raise awareness about

how the use of tax revenue, including the funding of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, has failed to adequately support education, including higher education.

*Standardization.* A third area related to the expansion of global capitalism is a movement toward increasing homogeneity, or standardization. This reflects the larger neoliberal effort to standardize products and commodities for the benefit of global trade; in simple terms, if products and services can be guaranteed to meet certain standards, then the risk to international exchange is decreased and global trade is enhanced. Of course, the World Trade Organization has played a key role here, including their efforts to treat higher education as an exchangeable service to be governed by multinational trade agreements. Consequently, we see policies such as GATS shaping the ways in which universities and their entrepreneurial professors interact with other universities and their multinational partners. Additionally, regional entities such as the European Union also are producing forms of standardization in terms of curricula and graduation requirements. Indeed, a goal of the EU is to create a multinational system of higher education in which a student from Germany, for example, can transfer to a university in Italy without losing money or academic units. Such ability requires massive coordination and standardization.

There is another form of standardization, which derives in part from the influence of global capitalism, but also relates to cultural globalization and the influence of powerful countries such as the United States. In certain higher education circles we have long spoken of a phenomenon described as “institutional drift”: It is the idea that all colleges and universities in one form or another want to be like Harvard or Stanford. Thus, academic leaders often mimic the elite research universities, as they seek to

become more like them; in essence, they aim to increase their status and potential for generating revenue. In some sense, and not simply because of mimicry, but also because of the ability of the United States to influence the global higher education market, more and more universities around the world are adopting policies and practices endemic to the U.S. higher education system. This clearly is the case in Mexico, where a culture rooted in “academic capitalism” is increasingly shaping the interactions among academics to such an extent that the once powerful norm of collectivism is rapidly being replaced by a culture of individualism (Bensimon and Ordorika 2006). Of course, some describe this cultural phenomenon as the “Americanization” or the “McDonalidization” (or “McDonaldisation”) of the world (Barber 1995; Ritzer 1993).

Accreditation processes also serve the goal of standardization, as increasingly countries around the world are brought to common standards by global trade and inter-governmental organizations, such as the WTO and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, more commonly known as UNESCO, which has sought to develop an international quality-assurance agency to monitor global higher education ventures. To resist these accreditation processes is to potentially situate one’s university on a remote island, away from the global market and the financial benefits of academic capitalism.

Thus, processes related to deregulation, privatization, and standardization may all be seen as part of a broader force associated with the growing influence of global capitalism. But clearly, privatization is at the center of this force, for it is a central element of classic capitalist ideology. From the perspective of privatization advocates, such as the likes of economist Milton Friedman, the move to eliminate the public sector

cannot proceed quickly enough. For diehard neoliberals, the global economy and the societies that participate in it can only benefit from public functions being corporatized (Bakan 2004). With regard to higher education, we may think of this turn of events as the corporatization or privatization of the university—a turning over of a public good or function to the private sector, at least by a matter of degrees. There are opportunities here in that as states withdraw their financial support they also lose a degree of control. And so many universities today are freer to be entrepreneurial and shape their own destinies, within certain parameters of course. In the United States, for example, we see a thriving for-profit sector of higher education that increasingly challenges the traditional university for students. At the same time, we see a reduction in financial support for low-income students, as universities are forced to raise tuition in the face of massive budget deficits. The latter scenario raises serious issues as to whether or not neoliberal reforms are indeed “reforms,” or simply a regressive strategy aimed at keeping more money in the pockets of the wealthy. Ultimately, this scenario suggests that the market will solve whatever problems arise. However, if the dramatic student protests of the early part of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, in Argentina and Mexico for example, are a sign of things to come, then I’m not sure that closing the door to countless numbers of middle-income and poor students is a viable policy option. It certainly doesn’t meet my definition of university reform.

## **V. Conclusion**

In closing, I want to stress the increasing role of academic capitalism in shaping university life, for this trend suggests many opportunities and challenges for universities

in global times. As an example, I want to call upon the U.S. context given the incredible power of academic capitalism to shape university life.

In the old days, professors and scientists sought funds in order to pursue particular lines of inquiry that mattered to them. The funds were a means to an end. However, within the context of academic capitalism, generating revenue becomes an end in itself, as many faculty and scientists come to tailor their lines of inquiry to where the money is, sometimes with little regard for the ethical and social consequences of their actions. A clear example is the way in which the U.S. University has become co-opted by the Department of Defense and now plays a pivotal role in the production of weapons of mass destruction. From my perspective, many U.S. universities, most notably their academic leaders, lack in Paulo Freire's (1970) terms, a "critical consciousness" (*conscientização*): Just as capitalism can sometimes entice individuals and corporations to engage in less than honorable acts, the same is true of universities and the pressures associated with academic capitalism. So, for me, a major challenge that the present-day environment poses for universities around the world is to find a socially just manner by which to embrace elements of academic capitalism. Maintaining accessible forms of university education ought to matter. The role of the university in advancing peaceful solutions to global conflicts also ought to matter to us. Clearly, we need to find some kind of a balance between the need to generate revenue and the ideals of advancing a more just global community. Simply leaving universities and their operations to the dictates of the free market is unlikely to accomplish such a goal.

## References

- Apple, Michael W. "Between Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context." In *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 57-77), edited by Nicholas C. Burbules and Carlos Alberto Torres. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Bakan, Joel. *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power*. New York: Free Press, 2004.
- Barber, Benjamin. *Jihad vs. McWorld: How Globalism and Tribalism Are Shaping the World*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1995.
- Bensimon, Estela, and Imanol Ordorika. "Mexico's *Estímulos*: Faculty Compensation Based on Piecework." In *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas* (pp. 250-274), edited by Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Boron, Atilio A. "Reforming the Reforms: Transformation and Crisis in Latin American and Caribbean Universities." In *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas* (pp. 141-163), edited by Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Castells, Manuel. *The Power of Identity* (vol. II). Boston: Blackwell, 1997.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Profit over People: Neoliberalism and the Global Order*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 1998.

- Chomsky, Noam. "A World without War." In *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas* (pp. 39-59), edited by Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Cohen David. "Speakers Give Contrasting Views of Academic Caliber of Australia's Foreign-Student Market." *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*, October 17 (2005). <http://chronicle.com/daily/2005/10/2005101708n.htm>
- Del Castillo, Daniel. "Afghan Government Backs Plan for an American-Style University in Afghanistan." *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*, May 6 (2003a). <http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/05/2003050604n.htm>
- Del Castillo, Daniel. "American Colleges are Offered Grants to Aid in Revival of Iraqi Higher Education." *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*, June 2 (2003b). <http://chronicle.com/daily/2003/06/2003060203n.htm>
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (trans. Myra Bergman Ramos). New York: Continuum, 1970.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review* 72, no. 4 (2002): 425-464.
- Held, David. "Editor's Introduction." In *Political Theory Today* (pp. 1-22), ed. David Held. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

- Held, David. "The Decline of the Nation State." In *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s* (pp. 191-204), ed. Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques. London: Verso, 1990.
- Kellner, Douglas. "Globalization and New Social Movements: Lessons for Critical Theory and Pedagogy." In *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (pp. 299-321), edited by Nicholas C. Burbules and Carlos Alberto Torres. New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Mok, Ka-Ho. "Policy of Decentralization and Changing Governance of Higher Education in Post-Mao China." *Public Administration and Development* 22 (2002): 261-273.
- Rhoads, Robert A. "Globalization and Resistance in the United States and Mexico: The Global Potemkin Village." *Higher Education* 45 (2003): 223-250.
- Rhoads, Robert A., and Liliana Mina. "The Student Strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico: a Political Analysis." *Comparative Education Review* 45, no. 3 (2001): 334-353.
- Rhoads, Robert A., and Carlos Alberto Torres, eds. *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Rhoads, Robert A., and Katalin Szelényi. *Global Citizenship and the University: The Changing Context of Academic Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, forthcoming.
- Ritzer, George. *The McDonaldisation of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Oaks Press, 1993.

- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Slaughter, Sheila, and Gary Rhoades. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York: Modern Library, 1937.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002.
- Stromquist, Nelly P. *Education in a Globalized World: The Connectivity of Economic Power, Technology, and Knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.
- Torres, Carlos Alberto. *Democracy, Education, and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.
- Torres, Carlos Alberto, and Robert A. Rhoads. "Introduction: Globalization and Higher Education in the Americas." In *The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas* (pp. 3- 38), edited by Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.

## **Abstract**

In this article, Professor Robert Rhoads of UCLA examines the impact of globalization on universities around the world, with a particular focus on the context of the United States and its role in shaping global university reform. He begins by defining globalization as the shrinkage of time and space and then proceeds to describe the influence of five primary manifestations of globalization: global capitalism and intergovernmental organizations such as the WTO and IMF (“globalization from above”), social movements (“globalization from below”), cultural globalization, the globalization of human rights, and the globalization of violence of a massive scale. He then examines university reform in light of the preceding forces by focusing on movements to deregulate, privatize, and standardize universities. He closes by pointing to some of the significant limitations of the “academic capitalist” model of the United States.