

# UC Riverside

## UC Riverside Previously Published Works

**Title**

Neoliberal Policies and Community College Faculty Work

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7t18693h>

**ISBN**

9781402056659

**Author**

Levin, John S

**Publication Date**

2007

**DOI**

10.1007/978-1-4020-5666-6\_9

Peer reviewed

## 9. NEOLIBERAL POLICIES AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY WORK<sup>1</sup>

John S. Levin\*

*University of California, Riverside*

### TENSIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

During the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries community colleges became globalized institutions (Levin, 2001a). As such, community colleges reflect and (advertently or inadvertently) embrace neoliberal political and economic philosophies and adopt the business practices of the New Economy (Carnoy, 2000). Both neoliberalism and the New Economy focus on serving the interests of government and business, and not necessarily those of the public or individual citizens (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). By aligning themselves with these interests, community colleges direct their behaviors not necessarily to the needs and desires of their students and local communities, but rather to the demands and expectations of business and industry, governments, and multinational corporations. These institutions have positioned themselves as critical elements in workforce and economic development, yet at the same time they continue to educate a broad spectrum of students, including substantial numbers of students in developmental and remedial courses (Levin, 2001a). To some extent there are tensions between the economic marketplace orientation of community colleges and their educative function (Marginson &

The names of individuals and their institutions in this text have not been identified in order to grant these individuals and institutions anonymity as agreed to in the research protocol for field work.

<sup>1</sup>The foundation of this work is presented in Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R., *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006). As well, the contribution of Veronica Diaz and John Cheslock informed the discussion here on instructional technology.

\*Graduate School of Education, University of California, Riverside, Riverside, CA 92521-0128, Email: [john.levin@ucr.edu](mailto:john.levin@ucr.edu)

J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. XXII, 451–496. © 2007 Springer.

Considine, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). This condition for the community college can be viewed within a larger context of higher education generally.

The U.S. educational terrain has shifted from a state of equilibrium with social democratic principles on one side of the equation and individualism on the other to a condition where personal social mobility and a consumer-based approach to education have prevailed (Labaree, 1997b). For higher education institutions, neoliberal ideology with its orientation to a globally competitive economic marketplace has become ascendant, even achieving status as the dominant operating system that both guides and organizes institutions to the extent that colleges and universities reflect a corporate not an academic culture, with economic interests and behaviors as paramount. The discourse on commercialization, entrepreneurialism, and academic capitalism is well-established, particularly for research universities (Bok, 2003; Clark, 1998; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000, 2004), but the linking of these to corporatism in the organization and management of higher education institutions, and to community colleges, is less well enunciated (Pusser, Slaughter, & Thomas, in press). Corporatism, especially elucidated through the example of the community college, is a valuable framework for viewing and understanding both the nexus of globalization and neoliberal ideology as it plays out in higher education.

This discussion is situated in the community college context and focuses upon community college faculty as a labor force in what is variously called the “new economy,” “new capitalism,” and the “new global economy” (Carnoy, 2000; Carnoy, Castells, Cohen, & Cardoso, 1993; Sennett, 1998) because of several characteristics of the institution and its faculty. First, the community college is clearly an instrument or vehicle of both state and federal government economic and social policy and thus tied to economic markets and behaviors that are global in their interactions (Cohen, 2001; Levin, 2001b; Mazzeo, Rab, & Eachus, 2003) and to the redress of inequalities promulgated by social policy. Federal economic policy, for example, reflected in the North American Free Trade Agreement, and state policy that legislates access to public services, suggests on the one hand the utility and on the other hand the enforcement role of the community college for government policy. Thus, community colleges retrain workers laid off in the manufacturing industry as a result of plant closures and industry re-location to another country; and the institution in some states requires undocumented immigrants to pay out-of-state tuition, which can be as much as five

times the amount as in-state tuition. Second, the community college is a productive force: its products are both workers and consumers for local economies; the institution produces both private and public goods. Both the work and the consumption of these products—students—have implications for a globally competitive economy. For example, the training of a workforce in an aircraft mechanics associate's degree program at a community college that is aligned with the Boeing Corporation is clearly connected to the global economy and sustains Boeing's global position. Third, the community college's student demographics—the result of an open-access philosophy and a mission that incorporates social mobility for the underserved—include a broad spectrum of society, particularly a population that is not connected to four-year colleges and universities (Roueche & Roueche, 1999). Part of this population reflects the social welfare/social agency identity of the community college: those who are the underserved, the neglected, and the disadvantaged in U. S. society, arguably a consequence of both old and new capitalism (Freeman, 2005; Grubb, Badway, & Bell, 2003; Jacobs & Winslow, 2003; Levin, forthcoming). Fourth and finally, the major workforce in the institution—the faculty—are more a labor force than professionals, managed by collective agreements and state legislation that limit their autonomy and role in governance and by administrators who are increasingly intrusive in the faculty domain of instruction (Levin, Kater, & Wagoner, 2006; Rhoades, 1998). State legislation often omits community college faculty from an authoritative governance or decision-making role and cedes that role to either the governing board and president/chancellor or governing board alone.<sup>2</sup> In California, for example, where the highly touted participatory governance role for faculty has been claimed arising from Assembly Bill 1725 in 1988, faculty have only an advisory role in institutional decision making, and authority is vested in boards and chief executive officers (Kater & Levin, 2005). Thus, decisions, customarily assumed as the domain of faculty, as professionals, such as the use of distance education as an instructional mode of delivery, are vested in management, and faculty can only take issue, formally, through collective bargaining if they are unionized and if managerial action violates the terms of the collective agreement. In such a context of managerial authority, the dynamics of higher education in the new economy are readily apparent, given the proximity of the community college to the economic marketplace and to government.

<sup>2</sup> Where faculty are board members their role is as non-voting members, excepting some Canadian jurisdictions.

While government buffers the community college from global shocks such as the collapse of national economies, there is little distance between local populations and the institution, as well as decreasing distance between the college and business and industry. Moreover, there is barely a crack in the wall between government and the community college (Cohen, 2001; Levin, 2001b). The connection then between the institution and the responses of government and business and industry to the new economy should not be a surprise although this is rarely acknowledged in explaining organizational behaviors.

The discussion that follows relies upon investigations that, as a whole, employ mixed methods drawing upon both qualitative and quantitative research traditions. Both the methods of inquiry, as well as the data that inform this discussion, rely upon longitudinal studies and previous research, involving field work, analysis of large data sets—both quantitative and qualitative—and document analysis (Levin, 2001a; Levin et al., 2006). The data sets include community colleges in both the U.S. and Canada: institutional, state/provincial document data as well as national policy document data from 1989 to 2004, interviews conducted by multiple researchers from 1997 to 2004, on-site observations from 1997 to 2004, and national quantitative and statistical data sets. Specifically relevant for this discussion were the 1993 and 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF 93 and NSOPF 99) and the 1995–1996 and 1998–1999 and Spring 2003 Higher Education Contract Analysis System (HECAS) CD-ROMs made available by the National Education Association. Quantitative methods are used to examine both part-time faculty and faculty use of technology and rely upon the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) of 1993 and 1999 (Levin et al., 2006). Data on governance come from document analysis and interview data from public community colleges across the United States and Canada. Through document analysis of collective bargaining agreements, cross-sectional data indexing across the data set is used to evaluate faculty participation in governance (Levin et al., 2006).

Qualitative methods and case study methods contribute to the discovery of new phenomena; reflect the need for a more in-depth understanding of naturalistic settings; underscore the importance of understanding context; and reveal the complexity of implementing organizational and technological change (Eisenhardt, 1989; Le Compte & Preissle, 1993; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Mason, 1996; Maxwell, 2005). Extensive interviews of over 400 institutional members and prolonged on-site observations over nearly a decade,

as well as institutional and government documents, comprise the qualitative data sources (Levin, 2001a; Levin et al., 2006). Finally, data and data analysis are supplemented by an on-going investigation of students and organizational behaviors in thirteen community colleges in nine states (Levin, forthcoming).

The concepts that frame these empirical investigations—globalization, neoliberalism, and corporatism—although interconnected, can be and are treated separately. The implications for education, and specifically for higher education, through these frames, are both broad and diverse. In the institution known as the community college, these concepts have particular saliency and provide a heuristic for explaining institutional change.

## GLOBALIZATION

The scholarly literature on globalization, while divided in its orientation toward economics, information, culture, and politics, is not as naïve as popular discussions which understand globalization as a unitary condition. Indeed, scholarly discussions frame globalization as both condition and process (Robertson, 1992). Furthermore, scholarship indicates that the process of globalization results in heterogeneity as much as homogeneity (Guillén, 2001). Globalization is understood as connecting activities and relationships across constructs of time and space, as well as physical distances, and while Roland Robertson (Robertson, 1992) conceptualizes globalization as “the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole,” such a connection is viewed popularly as connoting equality or sameness (Friedman, 1999; Friedman, 2005). Although global flows of ideas, images, products, people, and transactions suggest a ‘global village,’ the conditions and the outcomes are not necessarily common as there are disjunctures in this movement, including differences in culture and economics (Appadurai, 1990). Disparities in social values and economic conditions cannot be ignored: thus rich and poor within a single country or the contrasting wealth and poverty of nations, as well as belief systems of groups—clans, tribes, sects, ethnic populations, religious organizations, and nations as a whole—do not disappear under the globalization process. Indeed, there is intensification of tensions and conflicts during global transactions as identities and ways of life are threatened (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999).

Networked electronic technology speeds up social and economic transactions, and the current phase of globalization—over the past twenty to twenty-five years—is, if not structured, then at least propelled by electronic technology and networked systems (Castells, 2000). This speeding up of both transactions and interactions constitutes hyperactivity in real time and the norm within cyber time, and thus two planes of existence (real and cyber) are operational, even expected, for those who live in a postindustrial society. This of course leads to differing expectations for human interactions, including responses to both requests and demands such as reactions to communication and experiences and decisions for future action. But for those who live in other societies—developing countries and low socio-economic spheres within postindustrial societies—there is a single plane of existence and it is hardly a global society.

In the language of globalization, there are “periphery” and “core,” “mainstream” and “marginal,” and “winners” and “losers” as the dividing concepts that advance in their salience as neoliberal ideology gains ascendancy globally, particularly through the practices of governments. Indeed, government and government policy have become principal vehicles for the globalization process, one oriented to global economic competition. As instruments of government, higher education institutions have become neoliberal institutions, emphasizing economic markets and consumers (Levin, 2001a; J. Levin, 2005; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000).

## NEOLIBERALISM

Essentially an economic ideology, neoliberalism has roots in Adam Smith’s eighteenth century treatise, *Wealth of Nations* (Clarke, 2005). Some argue that neoliberalism is inseparable from imperialism and globalization (Saad-Filho & Johnston, 2005). Arguably since 1980, neoliberalism has dominated social and economic policy in the U.S. and in other developed industrial societies, including countries of the European Union (Palley, 2005). The discourse of neoliberalism includes the valorization of individual economic worth, through production, and a free market. However, while ‘the good for all’ is extolled as an outcome virtue—such as rising standards of living or consumption in Smith’s terms—neoliberalism is tied to capitalism and profit is the goal of that system (Clarke, 2005). Thus, we might call neoliberalism economic hyper-capitalism.

Neoliberalism could be described as the ideological complement to the mechanics of globalization. Noam Chomsky (1999), for example, argues that neoliberals justify the development of international financial institutions for the domination of vulnerable nations and societies through the dissemination of such norms as the liberalization of trade, market price-setting, and privatization. Because they control much of the international economy, dictate policy development, and influence public opinion, large corporations are the architects of the neoliberal project. Michael Apple (2001) summarizes the ideological commitments and ideal behaviors of neoliberalism. These include, among others, the expansion of open, economic markets; the reduction of government responsibility for social needs; the reinforcement of a competitive structure for economic behaviors; and, the lowering of social expectations for economic security. He concludes that neoliberal policies are framed as market solutions that serve to reproduce traditional hierarchies of race and class.

Within the context of neoliberalism, the economic marketplace is deified and thus institutions are valued by their relationship to the marketplace. Neoliberal critics have a different message: the valorization of the economic marketplace with relatively unfettered competition induces inequality (DeMartino, 2000); social and educational mobility for some ultimately excludes others (Sennett, 2002); the collective good is suppressed; and, individual advancement, often justified under the guise of merit, is vaunted (Campbell & Pedersen, 2001; DeMartino, 2000). Such norms have spilled over to education with serious and likely long-range effects. Schools are viewed as corporations (Giroux, 2002), with private interests replacing the public good (Puiggrós, 1999; Stromquist, 2002). For higher education, the charge of critics of neoliberalism is that learners are defined as or indeed reduced to economic entities and curriculum is surrendered to economic markets (Ayers, 2005; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> There are other understandings of neoliberalism that suggest that the individual is enticed by the prospect of economic "liberation" or "empowerment" and that the bases of neoliberal projects transcend economic ideology. Such a perspective was conveyed to me by Benjamin Baez in response to one of my papers (Baez, 2006). Simon Marginson (Marginson, 2006) takes issue with such an understanding and suggests that neoliberalism in action limits individual freedom: in neoliberalism freedom has the quality of freedom as control not freedom as power. Thus, individual agency is curtailed.



## CORPORATISM

Arguably, corporations have replaced national governing authorities in numerous spheres of social and economic life (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994). Because they can control communications, economic transactions, and the distribution of material objects, corporations dominate global, national, and local activities. Corporations are increasingly unaccountable to public authorities. More abstractly, Saul (1995) defines corporatism as an ideology in which rationality is central and essential. Critical of the postmodern acceptance of corporatism, Saul argues that it undermines the legitimacy of democratic citizenship. In other words, in corporatism legitimacy is found in the private group, rather than in the individual agent. Casey (1995) also studies group-versus-individual behavior, discussing corporatism as the methods through which workers and managers deal with rapid technological changes within the work organization. Thus, corporatism represents a movement away from individual agency and toward the incorporation of decision-making processes within an economic entity.

The workforce in colleges and universities is increasingly framed by educational managers, government, and such private sector interests as corporate employees even though higher education historically existed in a separate sphere from business and industry. Scholars note these differences based upon cultural and social values found in academe (Bok, 2003; Gould, 2003; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). In this sense, universities and colleges have transformed, conceptually though perhaps not in practice, from earlier functions, even if they are not, using Readings' term, "ruined" (Readings, 1997). Community colleges, too, may have followed this path (Levin, 2002).

Corporate culture has expanded from the world of business and industry to higher education, from the structures of authority—the concept of executive and executive decision making—to the monolithic image that the institution projects, including the ubiquitous website. Indeed, the deliberate design of homogenous organizational behaviors facilitated and enhanced by advanced automation and informational technologies is a seminal characteristic of corporate cultures in our age (Casey, 1995). Within the design of the corporate culture at the community college, faculty are compelled to participate beyond their own domain of teaching in the official work of the corporation, including changes to the social outcomes of their work. For example, in their participation in and implementation of quality improvement

systems, faculty are partners in the re-definition of students as customers or consumers and themselves as a team or collective and no longer autonomous professionals. Not only do these behaviors aid in the advancement of corporatism but they also mitigate against a counter culture that might rise in response to hegemony, what Casey refers to as the “corporate colonization of the self” (Casey, 1995). Ironically, while the discourse of this corporate culture in the community college emphasizes diversity, critical thinking, and creativity—usually brought together within the concept of ‘the learning college’ (Levin et al., 2006)—this is a simulated world, a bounded system that is a fabrication where relationships and meaning are constructed under the corporate rubric (Casey, 1995). Team work, an underlying assumption of process for the learning college, relies upon surface experiences—the ties that bind, so to speak—and does not threaten the power structure of the corporation (Sennett, 1998). The semblance of a cohesive unit combined with familial relationships appears similar to the 1960s and early 1970s for community colleges as new faculty and administrators worked together in a pre-unionized institution and a relatively small environment, where most of the employees were full-time and considerably younger on average than they are in the 2000s (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Levin, 2001a). By the 2000s, however, both management systems and advanced technology framed employee participation and the core of faculty work—teaching—as aiding in the institution’s productivity. More students—the lifeblood of community college financing—led to large instructional loads and an increase in part-time faculty (Levin, 2001a; J. Levin, 2005; Levin et al., 2006; J. S. Levin, 2005). These behaviors sound a good deal like those that have taken place over the past two decades in the private sector as noted by Vicki Smith (Smith, 2001). “Employee involvement programs, organizational arrangements that removed managers from the circuit of control, and egalitarian rhetoric created a decentralized and postbureaucratic apparatus that tightened its hold on workers and increasingly implicated them in the efficiency and profit goals of management” (p. 7). For higher education, generally, Gary Rhoades (Rhoades, 1998) argues that managers have extended their management of instruction primarily through faculty’s use of new instructional technologies and delivery modes: “Technology expands managers’ flexibility not by enhancing their control over faculty in traditional curricula, but by enabling them to develop new curricular areas and hire new faculty outside the purview of traditional contractual and academic/faculty constraints” (p. 193).

## HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AT THE NEXUS OF NEOLIBERAL IDEOLOGY AND ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION

Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997) have detailed the development of the research university in four countries—U.S., Canada, the United Kingdom, and Australia—to its role as research and development site for national economic prosperity. In achieving this status, the research university has altered its organizational behaviors to emulate those in the for-profit business and industrial sector. University professors have become academic capitalists, developing products and moving them to market so that profit or prestige, or both, is attained. Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2004) take the alteration of the research university in two other directions: first in expanding the institutional changes to include universities and colleges, generally; and second in broadening the behaviors to include administrators, students, and external constituents. Beyond “academic capitalism,” there are now regimes: one of academic capitalists, including producers, managers, technical support, consumers, and sponsors. They suggest that present day higher education institutions are found at the nexus of neoliberal ideology and globalization of the economy.

### THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: *NEW WORLD COLLEGE*

A substantial body of scholarly literature, as well as a considerable number of ruminations by practitioners, has framed a common understanding of the community college over the past three decades. Since 1981, with Patricia Cross’s examination of the community college mission, followed by the 1985 edited work from William Deegan and Dale Tillery, and particularly Cross’s contribution within that edited work, scholars began to mold the concept of a modern, comprehensive community college. While the community college discourse prior to the 1980s did reflect an institution with multi-purposes and a variety of students, it nonetheless was conceived of as an alternative educational institution, framed by curriculum and instruction, as Arthur Cohen observed in 1969 (Cohen, 1969):

It is viewed variously as democracy’s college, as an inexpensive, close-to-home alternative to the lower division of a prestigious university; as a place to await marriage, a job, or the draft; and as a high school with ashtrays. For many of its enrollees, it is a stepping

stone to the higher learning; for most, it is the last formal, graded, public education in which they will be involved. The community college is—or attempts to be—all things to all people, trying valiantly to serve simultaneously as custodian trainer, stimulant, behavior-shaper, counselor, advisor, and caretaker to both young and old. (p. xvi)

This “all things to all people” label was maintained through the following decades, even to the end of the twentieth century as Norton Grubb notes in 1999 with respect to instruction, as do others when they argue about student access and outcomes (Brint, 2003; Grubb, 1999; Rhoads & Valadez, 1996; Shaw, Rhoads, & Valadez, 1999a; Vaughan, 2000). But with advancing post-industrialism and competition, as well as leaders’ efforts to increase institutional legitimacy, the smorgasbord approach and function began to abate (Griffith & Connor, 1994; McGrath & Spear, 1991; Taber, 1995).

Through the 1980s, the work of scholars, such as Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer, Richard Richardson, Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, and John Roueche and George Baker, as well as John Dennison in Canada, developed into a discourse that tied the institution to a more conceptually sound articulation of its purposes and identity (Brint & Karabel, 1989; Cohen & Brawer, 1982; Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Dennison & Levin, 1989; Roueche & Baker, 1987; Roueche, Baker, & Rose, 1989). This discourse became mainstream thinking about the comprehensive community college, even among national leaders and institutional practitioners such as Dale Parnell and George Vaughan. Indeed, the comprehensive community college was an understood and accepted entity for critics and boosters alike. Historian John Frye (1994) speaks about the various and conflicting perspectives of university professors, national leaders, and local practitioners; but they share a common discourse whether they are critics or boosters. The comprehensive community college—the center of the discourse about the institution—was an articulation based upon curriculum. Several scholars categorized this curriculum (Patricia Cross, Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer, John Dennison and Paul Gallagher, Dale Tillery and William Deegan); several critiqued its outcomes (Kevin Dougherty, Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, Richard Richardson and Louis Bender, and Lois Weis); and several argued to strengthen the resolve of those who championed its underlying values, such as access, and yet sought improvements in organizational performance (John Roueche and George Baker, John Roueche and Suanne Roueche). Later works following along the lines of this discourse of the comprehensive community college

include Robert Rhoads and James Valadez's *Democracy, Multiculturalism and the Community College* and W. Norton Grubb's *Honored but Invisible*. Both extend the discourse through critical examination of curriculum and instruction, first of students and second of faculty as units of analysis. The so-called critics of the institution, such as Weis (1985), for example, took the theoretical position that student opportunities and outcomes were the fundamental purposes of community colleges—either community colleges provided opportunities for social mobility or they reproduced structural social inequality.

The comprehensive community college was not only conceptualized as curricula, programs, and instruction but also viewed as bounded by traditional notions of education and training, encapsulated in a closed and rational system. There was an absence of external connections in this system, such as the political economy, and in the face of post-industrialism and globalization, the conceptualization of a closed system became outmoded (Levin, 2001a). While the scholarly and practitioner literature was addressing the comprehensive community college, the institution and government policy makers were enamored with a political economy resembling, if not identical to, neoliberal ideological tenets. The institution followed a different discourse than the comprehensive community college discourse, one reflected in the term “fast capitalism,” applied by James Gee and his associates to educational change (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996). In fast capitalism, the goal is organizational transformation in the private sector, promoted by management consultants such as Peter Senge, Peter Drucker, and Tom Peters. Through organizational transformation, it was assumed that institutions could cope and thrive in a new economy. Alternate forms of operational thinking, such as Quality Management and Organizational Learning, along with ways of rethinking management and teaching in higher educational institutions, evident in the works of Margaret Wheatley and Parker Palmer (Palmer, 1998; Wheatley, 1992), found their way into the mainstream of community colleges. One salient example of this new ethos is the “learning paradigm” (Barr & Tagg, 1995) promoted to replace more traditional forms of curriculum and instruction with student-centered teaching and learning strategies loosely based upon cognitive science (Gee et al., 1996).

Almost overnight, the community college became known in national discussions as “the learning college” (Tagg, 2003). The implications for the status and role of faculty are significant as one function of a professional—expert—is replaced by another—facilitator—in this paradigm (Gee et al., 1996). Indeed, the corporatization of the

community college comes about in part because organizational members become colonized under the rubric of the all-embracing “learning college,” a condition parallel to Casey’s “colonization of the self” (Casey, 1995) in the corporate world.

Out of this combination of “fast capitalism” (or changing organizational behaviors to align the institution with the private sector) and new thinking about organizational and individual learning rises *new world college*—an amalgam of for-profit institutions such as the University of Phoenix, corporate training programs such as Motorola University, open and distance education providers, four-year state colleges, research universities, junior colleges, technical colleges, and the comprehensive community college. On-line instruction, corporate training, flexible scheduling (including fast-track programs and credentials) and the provision of baccalaureate degree programs (both with a university partner and stand-alone community college baccalaureate degree credentialing) are no longer aberrant practices but mainstream characteristics of the institution (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Levin, 2004). Indeed, some colleges highlight their research endeavors and others are accomplished in the acquisition of research and training grants, including grants from the National Science Foundation. These were not characteristics of the community college during the 1960s, nor were these the mainstream of institutional focus in the 1980s.

Additionally, social services functions and community service continue to form components of the institution, and programs such as remedial education and English as a second language remain as substantial offerings at many colleges (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). These functions and activities, along with the traditional curriculum of university transfer and occupational and vocational education, clearly suggest that the comprehensive community college, in form at least, has accompanied this alteration. Perhaps the maintenance of traditional curriculum and its structure justifies those scholarly examinations of the institution that assume traditional forms of curriculum—such as academic and vocational—are the defining characteristics of the community college. Although the many parts, including vestiges of the junior college of the 1930s and the comprehensive community college of the 1970s, suggest a complicated, perhaps fragmented institution, to a large extent *new world college* is an integrated and coherent whole. The community college has altered to become *new world college*, not simply because it has added more components but because the ideology supporting, driving, and sustaining the institution—neoliberalism—has incorporated the political economy in the mission, purposes, and behaviors of the institution.

The term *new world college* is intended both to differentiate an institutional type from its predecessor—the community college—and to provide connotations that will characterize the institution. The connotations include an allusion to the use of “brave new world,” both in the work of Shakespeare and Aldous Huxley—the former as reflection of an advanced paradise and the latter as a condition where progress has eviscerated valued qualities of human life. Furthermore, the use of *new world* is intended to invoke the new economy, with its reliance upon advanced technologies (Carnoy, 2000).

The development of *new world college* can be explained in large part from the traditional narrative of the development of community colleges in the twentieth century. Yet the discourse on *new world college* is one that focuses on external constituencies, not local students and the communities from which they come. While access, and particularly access for new student populations, dominated scholarly discussions of the community college in the 1980s (McCartan, 1983; Richardson, Fisk, & Okun, 1983), seeds of impending change emerged in the late 1980s and 1990s. In 1989, Fred Pincus recognized the progression of economic imperatives and revenue generation for community college, and Kevin Dougherty and Marianne Bakia (2000) detailed the pull of contract training for community colleges in the 1990s. In reviewing developments in Canadian community colleges since 1985, John Dennison (1995) noted that, by 1995, colleges were faced with “fiscal restraint, new clienteles, a workforce vulnerable to technological change and economic restructuring, and a clear government expectation that public institutions will emphasize greater productivity” (p. 96). Thus, community colleges in Canada were coerced into entrepreneurial behaviors “in ways never anticipated at the time of their establishment [in the 1960s and 1970s]” (p. 13). The shift away from a focus on access for all and comprehensiveness is probably a result of viewing the institution as part of a larger economic and social system, where interest groups are influenced by forces outside of education (Frye, 1994). Indeed, the recognition of a postindustrial society by a handful of scholars began to alter the discourse to address “‘new learning paradigms,’ the impact of information technology, and a shift in ...rhetoric to a ‘community economic development’ model” for the community college (Meier, 2004). Additionally and often ignored in the scholarly literature, the productivity-efficiency imperative—stemming from limited resources, especially from governments—increasingly took center stage in institutional organization and behaviors (Levin, 2001a, 2002). Thus, revised approaches to curriculum and instruction

(e.g., the learning paradigm, outcomes-based learning), electronic communications, economic development, and fiscal behaviors, such as efficiency measures as well as fundraising, began to preoccupy institutional members in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

This stretching of functions and focus for the institution—from educational change to operational alteration—is euphemistically termed “innovation” and the community college has developed a reputation over the past two decades as the innovator among educational institutions (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Owen & Demb, 2004). Nowhere is innovation more evident than in the introduction and implementation of new technologies. The result is transformation of work through technology and managerial change in and around network enterprises (Castells, 2000). Identifying with businesses, the community college is an eager participant in conducting its business electronically. The rise of distance education, on-line learning, and computer-based management systems such as Banner and web-based information dissemination mark the community college as a progressive enterprise, altering to keep up with business and consumers (Levin, 2001a). Indeed, community colleges are arguably the exemplar of educational institutions that cater to consumers, from the low-cost price structure for their services to their goals of fitting curriculum to the demands of the labor market, thereby satisfying two classes of consumers—students and employers (J. Levin, 2005).

At the beginning of the twenty-first century community colleges have not only multiple and possibly conflicting missions (Bailey & Morest, 2004; Dougherty, 1994; Dougherty & Bakia, 1998; Labaree, 1997a; Levin, 2000a, 2004; Rhoads & Valadez, 1996; Shaw, Rhoads, & Valadez, 1999b) but also new alliances and a new identity. The alliances are with economic entities such as business and industry and political affiliations with neoliberal proponents such as those elements of government and business that foster economic development and competition (Dougherty & Bakia, 2000; Dougherty & Bakia, 1998; Grubb, Badway, Bell, Bragg, & Russman, 1997; Jacobs & Winslow, 2003; Johnson, 1995; Shaw & Rab, 2003).

An examination of the institutions' self-characterizations as well as those of the state and the national organizations of community colleges reveals the emphasis upon neo-liberal values. Such self-characterizations do not necessarily reflect actions but rather serve as both structures for action and the formal articulation and thus legitimate claim for specific actions. The vision statement for the national organization of the American Association of Community



Colleges (AACC) announces the legitimacy claim of community colleges nationally for a central role in the nation's economy and its further development:

AACC will be a bold leader in creating a nation where all have access to the learning needed to participate productively in their communities and in the economy. Through AACC's leadership, community colleges will increasingly be recognized as the gateway to the American dream—the learning resource needed to sustain America's economic viability and productivity. (*American Association of Community Colleges*, 2005)

The economic orientation is central here: the assumption is that one learns to earn and that the American economy requires these learners. Another national organization—The League for Innovation in the Community College—characterizes itself as an innovative and dynamic organization: “The League is the leading community college organization in the application of information technology to improve teaching and learning, student services, and institutional management” (*The League for Innovation in the Community College*, 2006). There are a considerable number of connections between the League and AACC and between the League and private sector business, including advanced technology corporations.

On a system level, within Texas, for example, the Houston Community College System, with five separate colleges and a total student enrollment of over 53,000 students, notes in its mission statement in 2005:

The Houston Community College System is an open-admission, public institution of higher education offering opportunities for academic advancement, workforce training, career development, and lifelong learning that prepare individuals in our diverse communities for life and work in a global and technological society. (*Houston Community College*, 2005)

Worker preparation is aimed at the new economy, a “global and technological society.”

On the one hand, legislation and statutes at the state level for community colleges continue to refer to these institutions as public, comprehensive community colleges with a primary focus upon education in its broadest sense. On the other hand, less legal language stemming from institutions and district systems as well as from associations

such as AACC opt for a focus upon economic matters, in addition to language that indicates that teaching of students is part of the mix.

Numerous colleges' mission statements reflect a corporate identity consistent with neoliberalism and economic markets. In a recent examination, David Ayers (2005) analyzed a sample of 144 community colleges with current membership in the American Association of Community Colleges, the national organization for community colleges. He then retrieved mission statements from the internet sites of each institution in the sample and subjected them to critical discourse analysis. Ayers found that the discursive practice associated with neoliberalism within the community college mission "(a) subordinates workers/learners to employers, thereby constituting identities of servitude, and (b) displaces the community and faculty in planning educational programs, placing instead representatives of business and industry as the chief designers of curricula" (p. 545).

In Canada, where community colleges have flourished since the 1960s, the mission statements of colleges across the country reflect a neo-liberal orientation as well. Seneca College, a large suburban institution in Toronto, Ontario, reflects in its mission statement the custom of economic development and job training practices of Ontario colleges:

The mission of Seneca College of Applied Arts & Technology is to contribute to Canadian society by being a transformational leader in providing students with career-related education and training. (*Seneca College*, 2006)

The Canadian flavoring here is the reference to "society," consistent with Canada's social democratic traditions and emphasis upon the social contract (Lipset, 1989). Yet, it is business and industry and the private citizen that benefit. Lethbridge College in Alberta, located in a city of close to 78, 000 people, claims both innovation in learning and a workforce development orientation:

Lethbridge Community College's (LCC) mission and vision are grounded in workforce development. This primary purpose is accomplished through a focus that combines the highest quality career training with strong partnerships in the community. (*Lethbridge Community College*, 2006)

Camosun College in Victoria, British Columbia, the province's capital, has a student population of 7,800 credit students and 10,000 non-credit students. Although Camosun is a college with a history that

includes a substantial focus upon university transfer programs, the college's mission, nonetheless, contains reference both to economic development and to social benefits:

Camosun College is a comprehensive educational institution providing our community with access to the knowledge and skills relevant to the future economic and social development of the region. (*Camosun College*, 2006)

This is not to suggest, however, that all community colleges have evolved to a position of serving a neoliberal ideology. Indeed, numerous community colleges continue to cling to the open access, comprehensive, student-centered focus, as exemplified by Dutchess Community College in Poughkeepsie, New York:

The mission of Dutchess Community College is to provide open access to affordable, quality post-secondary education to citizens of Dutchess County and others. As a comprehensive community college, DCC offers college transfer and occupational/technical degree programs, certificate programs, lifelong learning opportunities, and service to the community. The College provides educational experiences that enable qualified students to expand their academic capabilities and further develop thinking and decision making skills. By providing a full collegiate experience, the College seeks to ensure that all students achieve their individual potential. (*Dutchess Community College*, 2005)

Dutchess's mission statement is not unlike countless other community colleges throughout the United States; there is no emphasis on economic or workforce development. Indeed, Dutchess's programs, its sponsored activities, such as a lecture series, even its "award winning" campus landscaping, are reflective of a junior college, where the goals of the college are set on preparing students primarily for academic work at four-year colleges and universities or for employment. There is no language here about preparing a globally competitive workforce or for supporting the economic development needs of the state. While a similar orientation can be noted at Pasadena City College in California, their mission statement does add an economic goal;

The mission of Pasadena City College is successful student learning. The College provides high-quality, academically rigorous instruction in a comprehensive transfer and vocational curriculum,

as well as learning activities designed to improve the economic condition and quality of life of the diverse communities within the College service area. (*Pasadena City College*, 2005)

However, none of its stated mission activities or actions directly suggest actions that will address economic conditions. Instead, the language indicates courses and programs that “reflect academic excellence and professional integrity” and “foster a creative learning environment that is technologically challenging and intellectually and culturally stimulating.” All actions are underscored by “we serve our students.” (*Pasadena City College*, 2005)

Similarly in Canada, the focus upon the more comprehensive mission of the community college is also evident. At Medicine Hat College in the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta, a city of about 55, 000 people located about 150 miles southeast of Calgary, the college’s articulated mission reflects an orientation not unlike those of the colleges in the 1970s:

Medicine Hat College is a learner-centered leader in the provision of quality education, training, and services to its community. (*Medicine Hat College*, 2006)

Dawson College, an English-speaking college in the major metropolitan city of Montreal, Quebec, articulates a model mission for the comprehensive community college:

[T]he Mission of Dawson College is to provide a sound education in English to the broadest possible student population; to value the ethnic and cultural diversity of our College and to celebrate this diversity within the context of an English education; to maintain standards of academic excellence essential to our students’ future success and to provide the appropriate programs, services and technology to ensure that any student admitted has the opportunity to develop the skills necessary to achieve these standards; to continue to develop innovative and flexible educational approaches to serve the needs of our students; to affirm that the College, as a community, requires the participation and representation of all its members—students, staff and faculty—in its governance; to encourage the personal and social development of Dawson students through activities outside the classroom; to develop the role of the College as a community resource and as a centre for life-long learning. (*Dawson College*, 2006)

Aside from the emphasis upon English in a French speaking jurisdiction, the characterization here of Dawson College fits the

comprehensive community college of the 1970s and early 1980s in the U.S. as well as in Canadian jurisdictions where the model of the junior college of the U.S. was adopted (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Dennison & Levin, 1989).

Thus, from these examples, there is considerable contrast between those institutions that articulate a decidedly economic market orientation—one that serves the needs of business and industry—and those that champion the maintenance of the traditional comprehensive mission, with emphasis on education, in their self-characterizations. The discourse of the comprehensive community college, with its mission of access, its comprehensive curriculum (academic, vocational, development/remedial and community education), its student development focus, and its democratic governance structures (Cohen & Brawer, 2003; Levin & Dennison, 1989)—for example, in some jurisdictions there continue to be elected trustees—continues into the twenty-first century. Added to that discourse is a reinterpretation of mission and institutional features, subsuming these within the larger framework aligned with neoliberalism and corporatism. College mission statements that refer to student development, citizenry, and community as primary are either image-making devices or anachronistic as reflections of action.

The first part of the new discourse on community colleges, then, gives emphasis to external interests and the influence these wield on community colleges. Given this responsiveness to outside agencies, community colleges function as service providers with their faculty as public service professionals. As one of many service organizations in the neoliberal, New Economy, and global market nexus, community colleges seek to sell their products (curriculum and programs) to as many customers as possible. By meeting the needs of government or business, community colleges have opportunity for sales—recruitment of students in support of generating revenues from governments and of placing students in businesses. Government and business are the most important markets overall for community colleges. Similar to any diversified corporation in the twenty-first century, community colleges continually seek to reach new markets and sources of revenue (J. Levin, 2005). With each new market, new service professionals must be found to meet the market's needs.

In *new world college* faculty are more than teachers—they are consultants, salespeople, account representatives, troubleshooters—the human connection between the organization and markets. As such, community college faculty work encompasses much more than

teaching. Faculty are expected to engage in managerial work; they are the “floor models” for new technological products as well as the early educational adopters of information technology; and they interact with external interests ranging from contract training, to business partnerships, and to granting agencies. They train workers for industry; they participate in ventures with business; and they write proposals for grants and contracts. In short, they are expected to be more entrepreneurial in their practices, and their entrepreneurial behaviors are focused on economic efficiency, not necessarily educational quality. Within the framework of neoliberalism, they are what one business faculty member stated in her pronouncement on faculty as a labor force. “We are volume oriented worker bees and classified as government workers: this is the crystallization of bureaucracy” (Business faculty, Alberta College, 1998).

From the perspective of the first part of this discourse, faculty are viewed more as instruments than as autonomous professionals. They are clearly in that class of “managed professionals” referenced by Gary Rhoades in his examination of unionized faculty in the United States (Rhoades, 1998). In some cases, such as department chairs, faculty are both “managed professionals” and “managerial professionals,” subject to both close corporate controls and to reinforcing those controls over other faculty (Edwards, 2006). Indeed, community college faculty are a highly managed and stratified workforce within the field of academic labor. To the extent that community college faculty align themselves with the views and values of a corporate organization, they have become colonized, with behaviors as extensions of the corporate ethos.

Community college faculty resemble, or indeed are, New Economy workers. That is, they have become aligned with a globalized economy that values flexible, specialized production, particularly knowledge production tied to new technologies, and “multifaceted, pan-occupational team players,” who contribute to reduced costs, increased profits, or produce measurable outcomes, and expand markets (Casey, 1995). This perspective carries with it the assumption that community colleges are now different institutions from what they have been in the past. The concepts of neoliberalism, globalization, post-industrialism, new capitalism, and the New Economy suggest that advanced production relies upon new technologies and the work ethic of a labor force that is shaped by both a managerial class and corporate values, along with global competition. This further defines community colleges as organizations that function in a contemporary political economy.

## FACULTY WORK: CORPORATE LABOR

Both the ideology of neoliberalism and the process of economic globalization are key contributors to the work and identity of community college faculty. Over the past two decades, the community college has prized and pursued entrepreneurial activities (Grubb et al., 1997; Levin, 2002). In numerous cases, community colleges have developed an entrepreneurial culture where economic goals, such as productivity, efficiency, and revenue generation, have moved to occupy a central place in the institutional mission (Pusser, Gansneder, Gallaway, & Pope, 2005). Accompanying and perhaps abetting this shift to an orientation of economic competition are structural and labor alterations, which include substantial increases in the use of instructional technology, the re-conceptualizing and reshaping of institutional governance, and the formation of a new major permanent workforce—part-time and other temporary faculty. Community college faculty—particularly full-time faculty—are both recipients and promulgators of these actions (Levin, Kater, Roe, & Wagoner, 2003).

As recipients, faculty are affected in both work and workload. They participate in managerial work; yet they are peripheral to substantial decision making. They are beneficiaries of technology, both hardware and software, as state funding favors new technologies and managers allocate these resources to faculty. Moreover, they are objects of managerial expectations for increased usage of new technologies and increased workloads; and they are models for students' expectations as the users and demonstrators of new technologies. With the institutionalization of a part-time labor force, a class of faculty with limited pay, roles, and responsibilities as well as second class status, full-time faculty workload increases.

As promulgators, faculty advance the neoliberal project of an economic and utilitarian orientation to college operations. They are avid adopters of instructional technologies and integrators of these technologies into the curriculum (Roe, 2003). They are participants in the policy development and implementation strategies of information and instructional technology programs. Through collective bargaining and even system-wide planning, they are party to the productivity and efficiency policies and regulations of their college; they are compliant with the management. Full-time faculty also take on an overload of teaching as part-time faculty and perpetuate the part-time role. In the context of the new economy, faculty work and faculty identity can be viewed as not only highly managed but also corporatized

(Rhoades, 1998). As a California community college president noted in 2004, there are tensions within the institution over these practices:

[S]everal faculty in our Business department and our Accounting department ...were early adopters of distance learning, and have gone in a very original direction. They're the ones who've gotten grants; they've been highlighted, and there's a level of jealousy and resentment on the part of some faculty ...[N]onetheless, there's this kind of divide. They've published books, and so there have been accusations about them making all this money, and they're charging their students extra money because they're assigning their own textbooks. That's actually been an issue in three departments where some faculty have been saying they shouldn't be doing this. (California community college president, 2004)

Community college faculty are a major labor force in the United States and constitute one-third of all postsecondary education faculty (Statistics, 2001). As a labor force of 270,000, they epitomize professional work in the New Economy and the post-bureaucratic organization: they are predominantly temporary or part time; the majority bargain collectively for a restricted compensation package; they are not only influenced but also structured in their work by new technologies; and they are agents of a corporate ideology that arguably makes them instruments and not autonomous professionals.

#### INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

In line with production processes and revenue generation, the broader sociopolitical context is an important influence on the use of instructional technology within community colleges. While technology has modified the instructional options available to community colleges over the past two decades, the rapid rate of technological progress has also reshaped the broader economy in several ways that have affected community colleges. Rapid reductions in transportation and communication costs result in companies becoming much more geographically mobile, pressuring federal and state governments to reduce government spending to attract employers. Concurrently, institutions of higher education face greater student demand because the gap in economic returns to education has grown substantially. The gap in the payoff to education is part of a general trend toward greater income inequality, which some economists partially attribute to rapid technological change (Autor, Katz, & Krueger, 1998). In addition to



increasing the general return to education, the fast pace of technological change rapidly alters the skills required to compete in the workforce. Consequently, more students seek to take courses periodically for specific training, behaviors especially important for community colleges that often provide these services. Together, these trends point to the pressures from the New Economy that have forced community colleges to educate more students without increased resources from the government.

Manuel Castells (2000) identifies the New Economy as informational in that the productivity and competitiveness of units or agents in this economy depend upon their capacity to generate, process, and apply knowledge-based information efficiently. Because higher education institutions are viewed as premier knowledge-based producers, and disseminators of knowledge in the case of community colleges, the new economic context provides these institutions with considerable pressures and challenges (J. Levin, 2005; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Increased global competitiveness and an increasing focus on productivity are altering community colleges in important ways (Levin, 2001a, 2002; J. Levin, 2005). Castells (Castells, 2000) notes that the “generalization of knowledge-based production and management to the whole realm of economic processes on a global scale requires fundamental social, cultural, and institutional transformations” (p. 100).

Consistent with the trend of stagnant government funding along with greater student demand, community colleges are asked to serve more students without the provision of additional resources. At the same time, the mission of the community college has shifted from student and community betterment to a workforce development model that seeks to serve the “global economy” (Levin, 2000a). In such an environment, increased emphasis on productivity and efficiency and further restructuring, marketization, and commodification are expected. Among numerous institutional changes, such as colleges’ participation in contract training partnerships with local and foreign businesses and governments, rising tuition and fees, increased reliance upon donations from the private sector, a new focus on occupational programs (that is, allied health, business technology, and manufacturing), and a greater reliance on part-time faculty, there is an ascendant role for information technologies and emphasis upon new delivery methods for instruction (Levin, 2001a).

The use of information technology in both instruction and in administration is spreading rapidly in public community colleges and suggests that this growth reflects pressures from the greater economy.

Cristie Roe (Roe, 2002) outlines three factors that impact the selection and implementation of information technology within community colleges. The first involves government policies that provide incentives for community colleges to generate revenue, become more efficient, and meet the needs of business and industry for skilled labor. With respect to the provision of a skilled workforce, community colleges are under pressure to produce graduates who are employable, especially in the numerous jobs recently created that require mid-level management or technical skills (Autor et al., 1998). Indeed, governments directly promoted the use of information technologies in teaching and learning because their leaders make a number of assumptions about students and the needs of the economy, such as the view that new populations have different styles of learning than students in the past; that there are fewer resources available for higher education institutions and thus these institutions must realize greater efficiencies; and that the marketplace—business and industry—require technologically savvy workers (Levin, 2001a).

The second factor driving the use of information technology identified by Roe (2002) are the demands by community college constituents who want training in specific areas and flexibility in time, location, and pedagogical methods. These demands are both for greater use of technology within the classroom as well as increased course offerings through distance education, and they are especially important when considered in combination with two additional trends. First, community colleges increasingly make instructional decisions based on the preferences of their “consumers” (J. Levin, 2005). Second, the number of individuals who want additional education is rising steadily. As discussed earlier, the growing financial return on education as well as the imperative for updating one’s skills to meet the changing requirements of the labor market should increase the number of students who seek college admissions. In addition, demographic trends in many states (especially those in the southeast and southwest) result in a significant increase in the number of high-school graduates (Hebel, 2004). Given the limited availability of space at four-year institutions, considerable pressure will be placed on community colleges to accommodate these additional students.

The final factor driving the use of technology identified by Roe (Roe, 2002) is the response by community colleges to the expanding demands of their socioeconomic environments. Of special interest is the movement within community colleges to a more managerial or business-like culture, and the focus of community colleges on

the needs of business and industry rather than the local community (Levin, 2001a). Within that context, the promise of a new instructional approach that can increase efficiency and improve workforce development is and will continue to be attractive.

## GOVERNANCE

The changing face of management and governance is one of the major implications of a workforce in higher education that is structured by global economic competition. As community colleges continue to respond to local economic needs and employer demands, relying more heavily on workplace efficiencies such as the increasing use of part-time labor, they have the potential to turn themselves into businesses to the detriment of their social and educational missions. An environment of high productivity, dynamic change, and competition has become the norm. Community college faculty are not only working inside the classroom but, at many institutions, they are also participating with the management in institutional governance. Although governance is viewed as a mechanism for higher education's constituents to engage in institutional decision making, this participation and particularly that of faculty may be furthering the interests of the management in increasing the productivity of the institution's workforce (Hines, 2000).

In the past decade, there has been a resurgence of interest in governance primarily as the result of the effects of corporatization and globalization in higher education (Levin, 2001a; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Tierney, 2004). Corporate or bureaucratic authority threatens the professional and collegial authority of higher education faculty. Community college faculty are not immune to such pressures as commercialization, productivity and efficiency initiatives, and accountability measures generated from within their institutions and externally by government and accrediting bodies. Labor relations within community colleges are undergoing alteration in response to global forces (Levin, 2001a). As already noted, community colleges increasingly direct their operations toward the economic marketplace in order to acquire fiscal resources or to generate student numbers, which lead to government resources (J. Levin, 2005). Institutional shifts in strategic and operational planning that change from a focus on expanding educational and training opportunities for the local community to achieving economic goals motivated by values of efficiency and productivity have affected the governance of community

colleges. “The academic world is collapsing in on itself [in the form of] job training for a consumer society” notes a faculty member in 2004 at community college in California, an institution that weathered ongoing budget cuts during the 1990s and early 2000s. Management, in an effort to improve productivity and efficiency, attempted to increase employee participation in governance. Participation in governance entails sharing in the workload of managers—a behavior consistent with community colleges’ integration into the global economy. This shift from labor and management competition to increased cooperation among stakeholders in governance through collective bargaining has been evident in recent years (Gilmour, 1991; Hines, 2000; Levin, 2000b).

While there is some evidence to indicate that community college faculty are not only legally permitted to participate in institutional governance but also required to participate, there is also evidence that this participation, with only a few exceptions, does not constitute authority in decision making.<sup>4</sup> Faculty professional rights are structured by government legislation which vests institutional authority in government, governing boards, and chief executive officers. Governance, including shared governance in community colleges, is the prerogative of management.

Recently, professional work in higher education institutions has been described as controlled by managerialism with increased emphasis on professional management, formal planning, accountability, centralized resource allocation, and directive leadership (Deem, 1998; Hardy, 1996; Rhoades, 1998). Rosemary Deem (1998) uses the term “new managerialism” to refer to management practices and values commonly associated with the private sector. In higher education, new managerialism focuses planning and operations on market-oriented behaviors, with an emphasis on entrepreneurialism (Levin, 2001a; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Institutional behaviors are increasingly oriented to generating revenues and reducing costs, economizing behaviors which are becoming customary in community colleges (J. Levin, 2005).

An organizational emphasis on productivity and efficiency and an orientation to the economic marketplace impact both faculty work and faculty values. One of the characteristics of professionals is their exercise of control over their working conditions. Autonomy in defining work and how it is to be accomplished is a signal characteristic

<sup>4</sup> The one exception in North America can be found in the legal framework of governance in the province of British Columbia for public colleges, generally referred to as community colleges (Dennison, 2000; Levin, 2001a).

of professionals (Brint, 1994). Organizational patterns of new managerialism, with emphasis on productivity and efficiency, threaten faculty autonomy. The current environment of high productivity, dynamic change, and competition has become the norm for community colleges (Levin, 2001a). Catherine Casey (1995) suggests that an environment of increasing workloads, rapid change, and competition comprise an adaptive strategy for organizations and their employees in an era of postindustrial production.

New managerialism and its effects on shared governance in community colleges are grounded in neoliberal ideology and alter the formal governance roles of faculty. Traditionally in the collective bargaining process, management and faculty have exchanged monetary rewards for productivity (teaching). Neoliberalism enacted through new managerialism has created a new pattern of exchange—participation in governance for productivity. In conjunction with pressures for economy and efficiency during a period of declining resources, management may be willing to share operational decision making with faculty in return for faculty productivity, a form of commodification of cooperation. Traditionally faculty have accepted the condition of higher productivity with the reward of higher salaries—“the faculty ...has been willing to trade that high level of productivity for better salaries” notes a part-time faculty member (2004) at a community college in California. But the promise of salary and benefit increases is waning under new economic imperatives. Faculty, at least through their collective bargaining agreements, are accepting an increasing role in managing the institution in lieu of resource rewards. Faculty are asked to take on managerial roles through participation in governance—over and above their normal teaching loads. “There are increasing expectations for faculty to participate in governance,” observed a faculty member (2004) at a Canadian college. Through collective bargaining, faculty have collaborated with management in increasing their workload by participating in governance through their work on committees such as faculty hiring committees, budget committees, and long-range planning committees. Yet, participation does not equate with decision making in that the faculty role in community colleges is at best advisory (Kater & Levin, 2005; Levin, 2000b). While faculty unions may have assumed that they were extending the rights of faculty, they may have agreed simply to participate in a neoliberal regime. Thus, the concept of shared governance in the community college may not constitute advancement in joint decision making but instead an increase in faculty work and responsibility for the management of the institution.

## PART-TIME FACULTY

From the perspective of managerialism, part-time faculty are clearly at a lower stratum of professional labor when compared to full-time faculty in the New Economy (Deem, 1998; Hardy, 1996; Rhoades, 1998). Although a lower stratum of professional labor, part-timers have also become crucial to the strategic plans of modern organizations. The use of part-time employees in recurrent tasks that have traditionally been fulfilled by permanent employees is promoted in current management principles. Smith (2001) sees this stance as a “paradigmatic shift” in the way that managers view the employment of part-time employees. This paradigm shift is evident in the increased, and now institutionalized, use of part-time faculty in community colleges. Senior administrators at community colleges are willing to accept the continuing exploitation of part-time faculty—even though they may not view their institution’s behaviors as exploitation—if it allows them to achieve those goals they deem essential for their colleges (Wagoner, Metcalfe, & Olaore, 2005). This exploitative use of part-timers enables colleges to increase efficiency and productivity while simultaneously increasing the authority and control of managers.

This drive toward efficiency and control exhibited by managers has affected the individual perceptions of part-time faculty. Emily Abel (1984) and Kathleen Barker (1998) have documented an important shift in the locus of control and motivation for part-time faculty. Abel argues that until the early 1980s motivation and control for part-time faculty was mostly intrinsic and based upon a belief in meritocracy. Barker noted that motives had become considerably more extrinsic by the mid-1990s. She found that part-timers were acutely aware of the new business efficiency model and its exploitation of part-time faculty. As a result, part-timers no longer blamed themselves for lacking a full-time position, but instead blamed the unjust system, a strong indication that the nature of part-time work in community colleges has changed and with it the perceptions and responses of part-timers as well. Barker (Barker, 1998) rejects the idealism of Gappa and Leslie (Gappa & Leslie, 1993), who argue that part-time and full-time faculty can form one faculty in the guise of a collegium. Barker recognizes the unequal outcomes of a competitive system, where individual economic gain is at stake.

The contradiction of workplace transformation in higher education is that it institutionalizes privilege for one set of citizens (tenured and tenure track faculty) at a cost to others. The failure of

inclusion within academe, or the success of exclusive membership, is revealed when a system of layered citizenship is constructed, made coherent, and legitimated (p. 199).

This is precisely the problem with proposed solutions to solve the part-time problem offered by Gappa and Leslie, as well as by John Roueche, Suanne Roueche, and Mark Milliron (Roueche, Roueche, & Milliron, 1995): best practices will not be implemented because they are not feasible economically. Arguably, part-time faculty conditions are more dire than in the past (California Community Colleges, 2002). The essence of the new economic use of part-timers depends on their increased exploitation, and unless there is a major crisis within community colleges resulting from the high level of reliance on part-time labor, behaviors are unlikely to change. That is, as long as community colleges are tied to economic development and private interests, and they employ the business models preferred by those interests, they will continue to view part-timers as a central means to control production costs. Furthermore, state policy that permits or even advocates the use of part time faculty exacerbates the problem.

Managerialism and the New Economy business practices it fosters have led to a contradictory labor market where temporary employees exist side by side with permanent employees. Both groups serve similar functions (Smith, 2001). Part-time employees are then forced to negotiate this potentially exploitative market on their own; those with rare skills and abilities may be valued commodities in numerous markets, while those with common skills will find themselves on the wrong side of a labor market chasm (Carnoy, 2000; Castells, 2000; Smith, 2001).

Both part-time faculty themselves and college administrators express these contradictions. Some part-time faculty speak freely about feeling exploited and marginalized, while others indicate satisfaction with their positions. The theme of exploitation frequently centers on salary. Part-timers who are dependent primarily upon the community college for their salaries are more adamant in their complaints. That is, those part-time faculty members without nonacademic employment or employment opportunity tend to be most troubled by their academic salaries. Part-timers who do not rely on their part-time salaries for economic survival express less negativity.

Employment ties to the private sector are correlated with satisfactory financial situations for part-time faculty members because those ties also add nonacademic motivations for teaching at community colleges, resulting in more satisfaction. Part-time faculty with strong

ties to business and industry tend not to portray themselves as alienated at campuses because they teach for reasons that have little to do with an academic career. For these part-timers teaching is a means to advancing their nonacademic careers. As one part-time technology instructor notes: “[in my business] teaching is a feather in my cap” (Faculty, California community college, 2004). Because these faculty members receive increased standing in their nonacademic careers by teaching at community colleges and do not focus on attaining full-time faculty status, they are not preoccupied with a lack of full integration into the campus community.

Community college administrators also present a weighted contradiction. While they express enthusiasm about the quality of some part-time faculty members and the advanced skills these part-timers bring to college programs, administrators are nearly unanimous in their view that the level of efficiency and control they need to manage their institutions could only come with the use of a large percentage of part-time faculty. Community college administrators indicate that they could not afford to run programs without the cost savings of part-time faculty. For many of these administrators their stated obligation is to their local community. One college dean (2004) indicates that “the mission is to serve the community ... We couldn’t be at every place for the whole community without adjunct faculty.”

Several administrators go further than stating that part-timers allow them to serve their communities, indicating that colleges are not obligated to part-time faculty. One dean (2004) is direct: “We can expand with adjuncts, or we can reduce what we are doing with adjuncts; and we don’t hurt the programs; we don’t hurt the full-time faculty.” Here, the paradigmatic shift from full-time labor to part-time labor has become entrenched in the perceptions of community college administrators (Smith, 2001). This dean also highlights that full-time positions are both privileged and protected by the tenuous status of part-timers. From this perspective, then, part-time positions are important only for the flexibility they offer institutions, not as means for part-time faculty to earn a living wage or receive reasonable employment benefits.

Arguably, the economic savings made possible by part-time faculty have a negative impact on instruction at community colleges. Data from the National Study of Postsecondary Faculty of 1993 and 1999 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2002) on the availability of professional development opportunities illuminate the lack of resources dedicated to part-time faculty in community colleges (Wagoner, 2004).



In both years, professional development opportunities were available to full-time faculty at a rate at least twice that of part-time faculty. The data also indicate that, on average, support increased for full-timers and decreased for part-timers from 1993 to 1999. This disparity is particularly important because community colleges are acclaimed as teaching institutions where quality of instruction is viewed as sacrosanct (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). To deny the opportunity for professional development to such a large percentage of faculty could have a negative effect on the quality of instruction at community colleges. What is particularly ironic with this finding is that during the same period scholars expounded on the importance of increased professional support for part-time faculty. The decision to exclude part-time faculty in professional development activities must be based on a desire to conserve resources, rather than improve the quality of instruction. Economic behaviors of community colleges, however, are not confined to the use of part-time faculty.

## VALUES

In community colleges, the predominant expression of faculty values is at odds with the economic behaviors of the institution. Although faculty are the agents of many of these behaviors—for example, they develop and teach the curriculum that serves both government priorities and business interests—they articulate their opposition to the serving of these interests by their college. As agents of the institution, faculty are compromised. As institutional participants, faculty consent to the choices and reasoning, and indeed domination, of administrators, governments, and private businesses—those who have power over the meaning of work in the community college (Deetz & Mumby, 1995). Faculty's work as educators—teaching, the development of curriculum, counseling and advising of students, and committee service—is configured or framed within an economic and competitive context, even though their values may be based upon other principles and other goals, such as personal and cognitive development of students or the social advancement of their society. Faculty frame this tension as a conflict between education and training, between traditional institutional goals, such as student-centered, and economic interests, such as business and industry-centered, and as a tension between centralized, hierarchical decision making and decentralized, democratic or shared decision making. Yet, these tensions do not result in a condition of overt cultural conflict between faculty and

faculty, faculty and administration, or faculty and external influencers including government and business. In this sense, faculty, with the exception of the faculty unions, could be considered to be situated at the periphery of both institutional decision making and institutional influence on matters of institutional action related to purpose, even though faculty work—curriculum and teaching—is the core of institutional action.

Although faculty claim that they are central to both institutional functioning and institutional purpose, and they certainly participate in the administration of work at the community college, their aspirations for the institution are unrealized because the institution's economic goals—including training for a competitive global economy—and policies, as well as accountability measures from governments, are pursued as priorities. The press for greater productivity and efficiency by governments and other external influences, such as business and industry, coupled with a managerial model of institutional decision making has called into question the professional identity of faculty and skewed their work as educators.

One college in research conducted during 2004 serves as an example of the changed and changing context for faculty and the resultant pressures and forces acting upon their professional identity (Levin et al., 2006). For Suburban Valley Community (pseudonym) in California, student access was a paramount value, with the concept of diversity—such as student identity, difference in the content of curriculum, and institutional social and cultural events—as the emblematic characteristic of discourse. Coupled with these values were the self-proclaimed behaviors of organizational members' performance: fast-paced, high intensity, and innovative. Such behaviors led to faculty expectations of activities that are beyond the norm of expectations for community college faculty:

People are now coming into a highly competitive environment, in terms of that skill set, and so we do have many more faculty with doctorates than you might find at community colleges, [with] the kind of publication record that our faculty might have...Many of our faculty hold offices in professional organizations...We're very proud of that, and I think it has upped the ante in terms of what we're looking for from the faculty. That has provided pressures with our collective bargaining agreement as well (College president, 2004).

These pressures, along with the budget problems of the day, which reportedly led to increased workload for faculty as classes were cut and

instructors took on more students in their classes, suggest that time was the preeminent commodity for faculty:

I would say that as an instructor there is so much time required for both teaching classes and doing these extra-curricular activities and professional development, and just an atmosphere of sharing in a collegial way the aspects of teaching and learning. I think that's what everyone wants. At least that is what I hear from a lot of my faculty, that we don't take a step back from all this busy stuff to better ourselves as individuals or just exchange information that is useful in the classroom. There is just not enough time for that. ...Part of it is the culture here and that this is a busy place. There are a lot of things going on; people just don't stop (Academic Dean, 2004).

A consequence of the pressures of a high performance culture was, on the one hand, a loss of personal relationships within the institution:

People now have far-ranging interests and we're much more diverse, so you don't have that same type of collegiality that we had before. I hear this from a lot of the old-timers. I'm not quite sure what they're saying all the time. Sometimes I think they say that a lot of these other people are just not like me, that it's hard to get close to them. Others are saying it's just harder for them to get involved with other people because there are so many demands on their time (Academic Dean, 2004).

On the other hand, what was lost in an environment of productivity and competition was what some view as the integrity of higher education, a critique apt for all of higher education, not just community colleges:

Now, you have Business schools operating separately, Law operating separately, and Medicine operating separately, and within the Humanities and Social Sciences all the specialization shows up as a cluster, a constellation of institutes. They no longer have contact with the core of general education. So, the student comes in and the programs that offer the degrees say, "We're not getting prepared students." Well, most of everything is being farmed off to temporary, contingent faculty who aren't part of the system, can't do the kind of collegial governance work that is needed to develop an integrated structure, and it's all basically becoming remedial...The community college is the goal, the ideal, the image of a democratized higher education that would provide the humanized possibility for citizens in a highly technical,

democratic society, but that is being co-opted by job training. Even if it's in the area of Humanities and Social Sciences, it's still being forced to be preparatory work to some line of career development or direction. The focus disappears from the educational experience (Part-time faculty, 2004).

Furthermore, faculty use of electronic technology and the growth of distance education at the college comprised additions to not only faculty workload but also performance pressures. Yet, full-time faculty continued to teach overloads, similar to their behaviors of the mid-1990s, sustaining these workload pressures, not because of love of teaching but because of the costs of living in this high performing area of California (Levin, 2001a). Overall, however, faculty values at Suburban Valley Community College are consistent with traditional community college purposes—teaching students (Cohen & Brawer, 2003):

Although I think we do a pretty good job of it, I think we need to keep reminding ourselves that the bottom line of everything we do here is student outcome. Sometimes we get focused on “the budget” or “the hire” or “the computer” and we may or may not consider why we are buying that computer or doing that hire (Chair of Faculty Senate, 2004).

I've always believed in community colleges because I think the focus is on teaching. You're catching a lot of students and getting them in those first two years thinking right and disciplined, and then they move on to universities. I don't think there's a better program going than the 2+2 program. I wouldn't want to be anywhere but a community college (Science faculty, 2004).

Budget shortfalls—reductions from state government and increased costs for instruction and other operations—were evident in 2004 at Suburban Valley Community College. Pressures on faculty productivity—and this played out as increasing class sizes—further expanded faculty work. Faculty responses indicate that college faculty are highly industrious and focus upon achievement as manifest in faculty concern with educational quality and student learning.

Notwithstanding the expressions of faculty devotion to students and to student learning—whether in the form of student-centered learning environments or outcomes-based learning—the role of faculty as autonomous professional is compromised in *new world college*. Budget problems pressure faculty to accept more students in classes,

in spite of pedagogical objections; funding limitations are justifications for the hiring of more and more part-time, contingent faculty, so that the college mission of access can be fulfilled; and competition for resources makes colleges dependent upon resource providers including the state, business and industry, and students so that curriculum and instruction are tailored, modified, and arguably corrupted to satisfy the “customers” as well as the political and economic agendas of external influencers.

### FACULTY WORK: PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY AND THE FAILURE OF NEOLIBERAL POLICIES

Unless faculty can extricate themselves and their identity from *new world college* or change institutional actions and the underlying corporate culture, this new environment of employee compliance with institutional purposes of a high productivity and market-oriented institution may constitute a more lasting norm for the community college. This condition begs the question about community college faculty as professionals. Furthermore, the parallels with the university and university faculty are obvious. In a neoliberal university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000), it is unclear whether faculty are autonomous professionals or professionals at all given that they are employees of a corporate institution that not only serves economic interests but also models business practice (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000). Institutional policies of both community colleges and universities that emphasize productivity and accountability (for example, faculty evaluation, post-tenure review, and program review that are managerially directed) are blunt instruments that homogenize behaviors to make faculty manageable.

Faculty identity in the community college, in *new world college* particularly, is tied to institutional identity and the behaviors of the institution that reflect upon faculty work. One group of faculty at a Canadian college in British Columbia agreed with a colleague who noted, “We are raising money rather than teaching” (Faculty, 1997). At a Washington State college, a humanities faculty member expressed a similar sentiment. “There is pressure to create competitive delivery modes...This is a movement toward the commercialization of education” (Faculty, 1997). The president of the faculty union at a California college reiterates the view of the college as a revenue-generating enterprise. “The mission of the college is to pass students to generate money” (Faculty, 1999). He continues: “Elitism

is creeping in with the use of the internet. The quality of teaching is [being lost]. Teaching gets lip service from administrators. Money is going to technology not to faculty support. The computer is seen as a tutor” (Faculty, 1999) The image, here, is of an institution whose behaviors are not so much motivated by the traditional mission rhetoric of the open-door college but by resources and resource dependency. Thus recruitment of students, retention of students from one semester to another, the use of technology and innovative approaches to instruction, and indeed services for students are all behaviors aligned with resource acquisition or the efficient use of resources.

Neoliberal policies that encourage privatization of a public service, policies that frame students as economic entities, as consumers and commodities, policies that valorize self-help and self-interest, and policies that rely upon economic rationales for educational decisions are antithetical to the ideals of the public community college. These policies involving new managerial practices, valorization of both economic competition and private sector behaviors, increasing programmatic orientation to the requirements of business and industry, and attention to specific kinds of outcomes, including a narrow and economically rationalized view of learning behaviors, have not yielded results or ends that further the mission of community colleges.

The wisdom in continuing such projects is also in question. The community colleges are both productive and efficient in the eyes of state and provincial governments because they enroll large student populations, many of whom have few or no alternatives in training or education, and their costs are low as a school. There is little or no evidence to suggest effectiveness as a consequence of this productivity and efficiency. Moreover, the student outcomes within the neoliberal project are suspect. Student transfer rates from community college to university have not improved over the past several decades (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, 2003). Even if community colleges have become more productive in serving more students with relatively fewer resources or through increasing offerings in distance education, to what end? Is teaching, then, in the community college better in the present than in the past with the rise of new managerialism? Not according to an extensive investigation which finds little to recommend in institutional instructional performance in the late 1990s (Grubb, 1999). Are all students better served than in the past in accessing programs and further education as a consequence of a more entrepreneurial and market-oriented approach promoted by governments and institutional leaders? Not according to several examinations of under-served

students (Grubb et al., 2003; Herideen, 1998; Jacobs & Winslow, 2003; J. Levin, 2005; Levin, forthcoming; Mazzeo et al., 2003; Shaw & Rab, 2003).

Little has been achieved beyond the disheartening change to organizational regimes and cultures, what Rosemary Deem (Deem, 1998) sees as “the adoption by public sector organizations of organizational forms, technologies, management practices and values more commonly found in the private business sector” (p. 47) and the alteration of the “values of public sector employees to more closely resemble those found in the private ‘for profit’ sector” (p. 50). The abandonment of neoliberal policies for higher education is a better course. Yet as this action is far from assured, the course followed by *new world college* is one that must be monitored and explained.

The neoliberal project at community colleges has not, however, engulfed the entire institution. Faculty work by and large continues to address the educational needs of students, and institutional staff minister to students’ personal and social problems. Individual action is often unfettered by corporate demands for accountability, efficiency, and productivity. Furthermore, the rhetoric and coerciveness that surround corporate policy and practice can be evaded by the skillful employee. The treatment of disadvantaged students by administrators, faculty and staff is a case in point (Levin, forthcoming). A basic education instructor at a rural North Carolina community college reflects on the plight of some of these students:

When I get up in the morning and I have my class to look forward to and I’m happy and I’m upbeat and I come to work, sometimes I think about if I were in their shoes, that in some of their shoes, I probably would not even bother. They don’t have that much really look forward to, or, you know, they don’t have that much encouragement. (Faculty, 2003)

Yet, this instructor is focused upon the immediacy of his students and what he can accomplish with them and for them. Although he teaches pre-college composition, he is also teaching students by understanding their lives and by accommodating them in his instructional world:

There are a lot of little things that we have to [consider]. Sometimes I think at the end of the day that I’ve been walking. Because I’m an active teacher, I don’t sit at a desk and give commands. Because I’m all over the classroom and at any one time I know what just about everybody’s doing. But sometimes I feel like I’ve been walking around eggs and eggshells all day. You have to with all of their

backgrounds and all the diverse experiences they've had: you have to be very acute. If a student comes in and they're sitting there and they're not participating and you just have a feeling, you just have to know to leave them alone that day because you don't know what's happened in their environment that's causing them to be that way. Or, if they forgot to take their Ritalin or just what happened: it can be tense at times. (Faculty, 2003)

Although faculty serve as instruments of neoliberal policies, they can and do lessen their connections when they view and treat students not as economic or even institutional entities but as individuals with agency and as members of a democratic society. In numerous cases, community college students are the disadvantaged of this society, and thus faculty work at its best ministers to the misfortunes of those students. Such actions transcend neoliberal policy.



REFERENCES

- American Association of Community Colleges. (2005). American Association of Community Colleges. Available: <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Content/Navigation-Menu/AboutAACC/Mission/OurMissionStatement.htm> [2005, January 17].
- Abel, E. K. (1984). *Terminal degrees: The job crisis in higher education*. New York: Praeger.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjunctures and difference in the global cultural economy. In M. Featherstone (Ed.), *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity* (pp. 295–310). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Apple, M. (2001). Comparing neo-liberal projects and inequality in education. *Comparative Education*, 37(4), 409–423.
- Autor, D. H., Katz, L. F., & Kreuger, A. B. (1998). Computing inequality: Have computers changed the labor market? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(4), 1169–1213.
- Ayers, D. F. (2005). Neoliberal ideology in community college mission statements: A critical discourse analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(4), 527–549.
- Baez, B. (2006). Discussant for paper session at the American Educational Research Association's annual meeting. San Francisco, CA.
- Bailey, T. R., & Morest, V. S. (2004). *The organizational efficiency of multiple missions for community colleges*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Barker, K. (1998). Toiling for piece rates and accumulating deficits: Contingent work in higher education. In K. Barker & K. Christensen (Eds.), *Contingent work: American employment relations in transition* (pp. 195–220). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barnet, R., & Cavanagh, J. (1994). *Global dreams: Imperial corporations and the new world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Barr, R., & Tagg, J. (1995, November/December). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 13–25.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: The changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brint, S. (2003, March). Few remaining dreams: Community colleges since 1985. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 16–37.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- California Community Colleges, A. S. (2002). *Part-time faculty: a principled perspective*. Sacramento, CA: The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges.
- Camosun College. (2006). Camosun College. Available: <http://www.camosun.bc.ca/> [2006, January].
- Campbell, J., & Pedersen, O. (2001). Introduction: The rise of neoliberalism and institutional analysis. In J. Campbell & O. Pedersen (Eds.), *The rise of neoliberalism and institutional analysis* (pp. 2–23). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Carnoy, M. (2000). *Sustaining the new economy: Work, family, and community in the information age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Carnoy, M., Castells, M., Cohen, S., & Cardoso, F. (1993). *The new global economy in the information age*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University.

- Casey, C. (1995). *Work, society and self: After industrialism*. New York: Routledge.
- Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Clarke, S. (2005). The neoliberal theory of society. In A. Saad-Filho & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism: A critical reader* (pp. 50–59). Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.
- Cohen, A. (1969). *Dateline '79: Heretical concepts for the community college*. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press.
- Cohen, A. (2001). Governmental policies affecting community colleges: A historical perspective. In B. K. Townsend & S. B. Twombly (Eds.), *Community Colleges: Policy in the future context* (pp. 3–37). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1982). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K. P. (1981). Community colleges on the plateau. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(2), 113–123.
- Cross, K. P. (1985). Determining missions and priorities for the fifth generation. In W. Deegan & D. Tillery & Associates (Eds.), *Renewing the American community college* (pp. 34–50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Dawson College. (2006). Dawson College. Available: <http://www.dawsoncollege.qc.ca/> [2006, January].
- Deden, A., & Carter, V. K. (1996). Using technology to enhance students' skills. In E. A. Jones (Ed.), *Preparing competent college graduates: setting new and higher expectations for student learning* (Vol. 96, pp. 81–92). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Deegan, W., Tillery, D., & Associates (Eds.). (1985). *Renewing the American Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 8(1), 47–70.
- Deetz, S., & Mumby, D. (1995). Power, Discourse, and the Workplace: Reclaiming the Critical Tradition. In C. Hardy (Ed.), *Power and Politics in Organizations* (pp. 457–486). Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth.
- DeMartino, G. (2000). *Global economy, global justice: Theoretical objections and policy alternatives to neoliberalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Dennison, J. (1995). Community college development in Canada since 1985. In J. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity* (pp. 13–104). Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press.
- Dennison, J. (2000). Characteristics of the university college in British Columbia: Governance and administration. Paper for an international conference on new developments in higher education. Bermuda, October.
- Dennison, J., & Gallagher, P. (1986). *Canada's community colleges*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

- Dennison, J., & Levin, J. (1989). *Canada's community college in the nineteen eighties*. Willowdale, Ontario: Association of Canadian Community Colleges.
- Dougherty, K. (1994). *The contradictory college*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dougherty, K., & Bakia, M. (2000). Community colleges and contract training: Content, origins, and impact. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 197–243.
- Dougherty, K. J., & Bakia, M. (1998, June). The new economic role of the community college: Origins and prospects. Occasional paper, Community College Research Center, Teachers College, New York.
- Dutchess Community College*. (2005). Dutchess Community College. Available: <http://www.sunydutchess.edu/> [2005, January].
- Edwards, J. W. (2006). *Department chair roles in the community college*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.
- Freeman, J. P. (2005). *Postsecondary education for the underserved in America: A study of highly non-traditional students in community colleges*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Friedman, T. (1999). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Frye, J. (1994). Educational paradigms in the professional literature of the community college. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. X, pp. 181–224). New York: Agathon Press.
- Gappa, J. M., & Leslie, D. W. (1993). *The invisible faculty: Improving the status of part-timers in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gee, J. P., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gilmour, J., Jr. (1991). Participative governance bodies in higher education: Report of a national study. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 75, 27–39.
- Giroux, H. (2002). The war on the young. In R. Strickland (Ed.), *Growing up postmodern: Neoliberalism and the war on the young*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gould, E. (2003). *The university in a corporate culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Griffith, M., & Connor, A. (1994). *Democracy's open door: The community college in America's future*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- Grubb, W., Badway, N., Bell, D., Bragg, D., & Russman, M. (1997). *Workforce, economic and community development: The changing landscape of the entrepreneurial community college*. Berkeley: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The University of California.
- Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.
- Grubb, W. N., Badway, N., & Bell, D. (2003a). Community colleges and the equity agenda: The potential of noncredit education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March 2003, 218–240.
- Grubb, W. N., Badway, N., & Bell, D. (2003b). Community colleges and the equity agenda: The potential of noncredit education. *The Annals*, March, 218–240.

- Guillén, M. (2001). Is globalization civilizing, destructive, or feeble? A critique of five key debates in the social science literature. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 235–260.
- Hardy, C. (1996). *The politics of collegiality: Retrenchment strategies in Canadian universities*. Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Hebel, S. (2004, July 2). No room in the class: As student populations explode in some states, public colleges struggle to find enough places—even for high achievers. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 19.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Herideen, P. E. (1998). *Policy, pedagogy and social inequality: Community college student's realities in post-industrial America*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hines, E. (2000). The governance of higher education. In J. Smart & W. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XV, pp. 105–155). New York: Agathon Press.
- Houston Community College. (2005). Houston Community College District. Available: <http://www.hccs.cc.tx.us/> [2005, June].
- Jacobs, J. A., & Winslow, S. (2003, March). Welfare reform and enrollment in postsecondary education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 194–217.
- Johnson, S. L. (1995). Organizational structures and the performance of contract training operations in American community colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Kater, S., & Levin, J. (2005). Shared governance in community colleges in the global economy. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(1), 1–24.
- Labaree, D. (1997a). *How to succeed in school without really learning*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Labaree, D. (1997b). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39–81.
- Le Compte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- The League for Innovation in the Community College. (2006). The League for Innovation in the Community College. Available: [http://www.league.org/league/about/about\\_main.htm](http://www.league.org/league/about/about_main.htm) [2006, July 23].
- Lethbridge Community College. (2006). Lethbridge Community College. Available: <http://www.lethbridgecollege.ab.ca/> [2006, February].
- Levin, J. (2000a). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the 20th century. *Community College Review*, 28(2), 1–25.
- Levin, J. (2000b). What's the impediment? Structural and legal constraints to shared governance in the community college. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXX(2), 87–122.
- Levin, J. (2001a). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century*. New York: Palgrave.
- Levin, J. (2001b). Public policy, community colleges, and the path to globalization. *Higher Education*, 42(2), 237–262.
- Levin, J. (2002). In education and work: The globalized community college. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXXII(2), 47–78.
- Levin, J. (2004). The Community College as a Baccalaureate-Granting Institution. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(1), 1–22.

- Levin, J. (2005). The business culture of the community college: Students as consumers; students as commodities. In B. Pusser (Ed.), *Arenas of entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit institutions compete* (Vol. 129, pp. 11–26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levin, J., & Dennison, J. (1989). Responsiveness and renewal in Canada's community colleges: A study of organizations. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XIX(2), 41–57.
- Levin, J., Kater, S., Roe, C., & Wagoner, R. (2003, April). Not professionals?: Community college faculty in the new economy. Symposium for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Levin, J., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. (2006). *Community college faculty: At work in the new economy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Levin, J. S. (2005). The business culture of the community college: Students as consumers; students as commodities. In B. Pusser (Ed.), *The Emerging Competitive Environment for Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levin, J. S. (forthcoming). *Non-traditional students and community colleges: The conflict of justice and neo-liberalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lipset, S. M. (1989). *Continental divide: The values and institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge.
- Marginson, S. (2006). *Freedom as control and the control of freedom: F.A. Hayek and the academic imagination*. Unpublished manuscript, Melbourne, Australia.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mazzeo, C., Rab, S., & Eachus, S. (2003). Work-first or work-study: Welfare reform, state policy and access to postsecondary education. *The Annals*, March, 144–171.
- McCartan, A.-M. (1983). The community college mission: Present challenges and future visions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54(6), 676–692.
- McGrath, D., & Spear, M. (1991). *The academic crisis of the community college*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Medicine Hat College. (2006). Medicine Hat College. Available: <http://www.mhc.ab.ca/> [2006, January].
- Meier, K. (2004). *The community college mission: History and theory*. Unpublished manuscript, Bakersfield, CA.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2002). *1999 national study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF: 99)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Owen, P. S., & Demb, A. (2004). Change dynamics and leadership in technology implementation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(6), 636–666.
- Palley, T. I. (2005). From Keynesianism to neoliberalism: Shifting paradigms in economics. In A. Saad-Filho & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism: A critical reader* (pp. 20–29). Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.

- Palmer, P. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pasadena City College. (2005). Pasadena City College. Available: <http://www.pasadena.edu/> [2005, January].
- Pincus, F. (1989). Contradictory effects of customized contract training in community colleges. *Critical Sociology*, 16(1), 77–93.
- Puiggrós, A. (1999). *Neoliberalism and education in the Americas*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Pusser, B., Gansneder, B., Gallaway, N., & Pope, N. (2005). Entrepreneurial activity in nonprofit institutions: A portrait of continuing education. In B. Pusser (Ed.), *Arenas of entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit institutions compete* (pp. 27–42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pusser, B., Slaughter, S., & Thomas, S. (in press). Playing the board game: An empirical analysis of university trustee and corporate board interlocks. *The Journal of Higher Education*.
- Readings, B. (1997). *The university in ruins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed professionals: Unionized faculty and restructuring academic labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rhoads, R., & Valadez, J. (1996). *Democracy, multiculturalism, and the community college*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Richardson, R., Fisk, E., & Okun, M. (1983). *Literacy in the open-access college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Roe, C. (2003). Effects of information technology on community college faculty. Paper presentation, American Education Research Association, Chicago, April.
- Roe, C. E. (2002). *Effects of Informational Technology on Community College Faculty*. The University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Roueche, J., & Baker, G. A., III. (1987). *Access and excellence*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- Roueche, J., Baker, G. A., III, & Rose, R. (1989). *Shared vision*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- Roueche, J., Roueche, S., & Milliron, M. (1995). *Strangers in their own land: Part-time faculty in American community colleges*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Roueche, J. E., & Roueche, S. D. (1999). *High stakes, high performance: Making remedial education work*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Saad-Filho, A., & Johnston, D. (2005). Introduction. In A. Saad-Filho & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism: A critical reader* (pp. 1–6). Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.
- Saul, J. R. (1995). *The unconscious civilization*. Concord, Ontario: House of Anansi Press.
- Seneca College. (2006). Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology. Available: <http://www.senecac.on.ca/cms/> [2006, February].
- Sennett, R. (1998). *The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Sennett, R. (2002). A flawed philosophy. *Guardian Weekly*, 15.
- Shaw, K., & Rab, S. (2003). Market rhetoric versus reality in policy and practice: The Workforce Investment Act and access to community college education and training. *The Annals*, 172–193.

- Shaw, K., Rhoads, R., & Valadez, J. (1999a). Community colleges as cultural texts: A conceptual overview. In K. Shaw, J. Valadez, & R. Rhoads (Eds.), *Community colleges as cultural texts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Shaw, K., Rhoads, R., & Valadez, J. (Eds.). (1999b). *Community colleges as cultural texts*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism, politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2000, Spring/Summer). The neo-liberal university. *New Labor Forum*, 73–79.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, V. (2001). *Crossing the great divide: Worker risk and opportunity in the new economy*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Statistics, N. C. f. E. (2001). *Background characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions: Fall 1998*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Stromquist, N. P. (2002). *Education in a globalized world: The connectivity of economic power, technology, and knowledge*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Taber, L. (1995). Chapter and verse: How we came to be where we are. In J. Roueche, L. Taber & S. Roueche (Eds.), *The company we keep: Collaboration in the community college* (pp. 25–37). Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Tagg, J. (2003). *The learning paradigm college*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Tierney, W. (Ed.). (2004). *Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. National Center for Educational Statistics. (2001). *Background Characteristics, work activities, and compensation of faculty and instructional staff in postsecondary institutions: Fall 1998*. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Vaughan, G. (2000). *The community college story*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community Colleges.
- Wagoner, R. (2004). *The contradictory faculty: Part-time faculty at community colleges*. The University of Arizona, Tucson.
- Wagoner, R. L., Metcalfe, A. S., & Olaore, I. (2005). Fiscal reality and academic quality: Part-time faculty and the challenge to organizational culture at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 1–20.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science: Learning about organization from an orderly universe*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Weis, L. (1985). *Between two worlds: Black students in an urban community college*. Boston: Routledge and Keegan Paul.