

## **Neoliberalism and Postmodernism: The Scylla And Charybdis For Critical Pedagogy And What Can Be Done About It**

**Angelo Letizia**

**Newman University**

### **Abstract**

*For most of Western history many have held higher education institutions as paragons of freedom against the tyranny of ignorance and superstition and has imperative to shaping the public good (Bloland, 1995). The rise of neoliberalism during the late 1970s in the West however fundamentally questioned the role of higher education institutions in the process of public good formation. Roughly at the same time that neoliberalism began to question the purposes of higher education institutions, theories which became labeled postmodern also emerged and challenged the notion that knowledge produced by higher education was liberating. Rather, postmodern thinkers (even if they eschewed the label and a coherent school of thought) largely argued that all knowledge was oppressive and that critical theory, while well-meaning was futile. Neoliberals and postmodernist generally chafe at what they consider improbable utopianism albeit for different reasons (Allan, 2011). Yet, there are many of us who hold to the ideals of critical pedagogy and believe that justice can be achieved through education. The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate ways in which higher education institutions and critical theorists can create knowledge which promotes the public good, in light of neoliberalism and the postmodern critique. Ultimately, I call for the creation of a new academic discipline, higher education and the public good.*

**Keywords:** Neoliberalism, postmodernism, critical pedagogy

---

### **Scylla and Charybdis**

**F**or most of Western history many

have held higher education institutions as

---

paragons of bastions of freedom against the tyranny of ignorance and superstition (Bloland, 1995). During the 1960s campus protests in the United State and Europe, some even argued that these ideals began to materialize. Education and particularly higher education institutions were cast as fundamental to the public good because they challenged the barriers of racism, sexism and authoritarianism (Newfield, 2008). While a vague term, the public good has usually approximated a harmonious state of affairs where heterogeneous but equal citizens can engage in political discussions about their society, where criticism can lead to new solutions. In addition, there is also a relatively equal distribution of wealth or at least mechanisms, which help to distribute wealth more equally.

The rise of neoliberalism during the late 1970s in the West however fundamentally questioned the role of higher education institutions in the process of public good formation. Neoliberals generally held that all institutions, especially public institutions, should be held accountable to the market and should produce a trained workforce and profitable research, not deal with wasteful esoteric and social justice concerns (Harvey,

2005). This paper focuses mostly on America because America can be seen as a proxy for neoliberalism (Peet, 2009). Neoliberalism emerged in America and the United Kingdom and then was and has been imposed on other countries through global trade forums and policies, and sometimes direct force (Chomsky, 1999; Peet, 2009). Higher education institutions in countries around the world have been one of the main sites of enforced neoliberal doctrines imposed by the West (Rhoads & Torres, 2006). In light of the increasing market focus, many policymakers and even administrators in higher education began to ponder questions such as: Are social justice concerns too costly? Should higher education institutions mainly prepare students for the workforce or provide a liberal education? How much of the benefits of higher education are individual and how much are social?

Roughly at the same time that neoliberalism began to question the purposes of higher education institutions, certain strands of progressive thought morphed into a debilitating critique of the very structure of the knowledge production system of higher education itself. While by no means a

---

coherent school of thought, these theories usually fall under the title of postmodernism. One theory in particular which called into account the very structure and function of the university and its role as a knowledge producer was Foucault's theory of power/knowledge (Bloland, 1995). Foucault (1977) argued that knowledge and reason, far from the Enlightenment view of instruments of liberation, were actually tools of domination. Foucault and other postmodern theorists (some which eschewed the label) sought to understand how knowledge produced by higher education and in society in general, oppresses rather than liberates.

These developments highlight higher education institutions changing role in the shaping of the public good for any given region or polity. Currently, as higher education (and even post-secondary institutions) across the globe move to a model of increased privatization, where services and even core functions are outsourced to private companies, and where institutions seek to maximize their profit, attract the best students and create patents, the question of a just and equitable public good is becoming more complex and harder

to answer (Lambert, 2014). On the other side, when researchers and faculty members seek to rectify this situation, postmodern criticisms attack the very nature of the knowledge and ideas produced in institutions as oppressive or at the very least unable to lead to positive social change (Allan, 2011; Bloland, 2005). This paper sets out to chart a course between the Scylla and Charybdis of neoliberalism and postmodernism for those who practice critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is premised on the fact that suffering and oppression are not inevitable factors of human existence, but rather can be challenged with education (Kincheloe, 2007). Neoliberals and postmodernist generally chafe at what they consider improbable utopianism albeit for different reasons (Allan, 2011).

Postmodernism however is not necessarily dominant in the university, and in many cases, many academics would most likely argue that postmodern is not prevalent at all in the university. As Bloland (2005) notes however, postmodernism gives scholars a frame in which to view the changes in higher education over the last half century. Higher education as a postmodern institution

---

does not necessarily manifest from the works of individual scholars. Rather, higher education institutions taken as whole can be argued to exhibit postmodern tendencies. Universities are expected to meet many disparate obligations, from workforce training, to remedial education, to teacher training, to service only to name a few. This fragmentation of mission has eroded any sense of unified purpose for institutions (Bloland, 2005). Further, knowledge produced in higher education institutions is increasingly delivered in fragmented bits as specialization increases and further erodes unity. As knowledge and information increases, institutions face information overload (X, Fullan, 2001). In this state of overload, institutions have a more difficult time making meaning. One of the basic tenets of postmodernism is the loss of “metanarratives” or any overarching meaning or story (Bloland, 2005; Lyotard, 1979). Higher education was traditionally seen as the path to liberation. Yet, as Lyotard (1979) argued, this overarching story inherited from the Enlightenment was exposed as a lie. Higher education did not signal liberation; there was just daily existence, fraught with conflict and

ambiguity. The only thing reminiscent of a guiding story or purpose now is what Lyotard (1979) calls performativity, which is essentially workforce training and profit maximization. The metanarrative of higher education, which perhaps reached its zenith in the 1960s, the metanarrative of education as inevitable progress, is lost. This is one way in which higher education institutions can be viewed as postmodern, because of their lack of perceived purpose and the fragmentation of knowledge (Bloland, 2005). This lack of purpose severely hinders a universities ability to promote the public good.

At this point, neoliberalism and postmodernism are not contradictory as much as they are on a spectrum. At first glance, the main “purpose” of higher education today is as Lyotard suggests something akin to performativity. Performativity is essentially neoliberalism in higher education, workforce training and revenue generation. This is Scylla. However, on further inspection, neoliberalism does not really have a purpose. As Tuck (2012) suggests, neoliberalism is essentially a form of nihilism because it does provide any source of meaning or unity, it does liberate

---

or bind together. It is a thought system which simply promotes greed and atomization. This is Charybdis. Yet, Bloland (2005) argues that higher education should not abandon the ideas of the Enlightenment, the ideas of unity and liberation. Habermas (1990) said as much.

This paper follows Bloland (2005) and Habermas (1990). It proposes creating purpose *in spite* of the loss of the metanarrative. This is the course we must chart through Scylla and Charybdis. One way to accomplish this may be to create a new discipline or field which is solely dedicated to providing this sense of unity and direction for higher education. As one anonymous reviewer pointed out, my call for the creation of a new discipline borders on utopian idealism. The reviewer noted that this utopian idealism is not necessarily a negative, but it should be nonetheless addressed. Regarding this idealism, I follow Weiner (2007) and others like Giroux (2011), who argue that scholars must begin to imagine a better world than the one presently inhabited. This paper is an exercise in imagination, a possible blueprint for this better world.

## **Data Dissemination**

One of the hallmarks of a discipline or field is a specialized method of data collection. However, data collection can only be one facet of the public good in higher education. Along with data collection, the public good and higher education is concerned with data *dissemination*. Knowledge is created by it is not necessarily circulated (Cooper 2013). Cooper (2013) argued that the knowledge created by higher education institutions is useless if it does not inform policymaking and practice. Critical knowledge mobilization builds of Cooper's (2013) ideas. Critical knowledge mobilization is a democratic activity, but it transcends the boundaries of communities, states, regions and even nations. It also cannot be one sided or partisan. It cannot be liberal or conservative. For instance, two of the biggest supporters of performance based funding are Bill Gates and Barak Obama, both of which are democrats. In addition, as also \ many democrats had a hand in the creation of performance based funding and other accountability policies. The overriding concern of CKM must be evidence. All ideas must be based on sound

---

evidence obtained from sound research. In order to become this necessary vehicle of social criticism and creation, higher education institutions must challenge the truth regime established by neoliberalism policies and create new forms of knowledge. In order to challenge the current truth regime, which inhibits the creation of a truly vibrant public good, higher education institutions can begin to create and disseminate their own knowledge through the process of critical knowledge mobilization (CKM). Higher education institutions are bounded by virtue of their position in a vertical hierarchy with state legislators on top, thus, they must answer to the state (Richardson & Smalling, 2005). But colleges can simultaneously re-position themselves in the emerging glo-na-cal environment and build on horizontal networks.

Critical knowledge mobilization can facilitate and sustain the creation of glo-na-cal and other horizontal networks by utilizing the strengths and positions of Research Brokering Organizations (RBOs) (Cooper, 2014). The specific missions of

RBO's are to disseminate knowledge and research to policymakers and practitioners.

Following Cooper (2013), higher education institutions and scholars should seek to build networks with RBO's. These networks, driven by higher education institutions, can create and disseminate new knowledge. Of crucial importance here are faculty members at both public and private colleges. Of course, the term faculty is too monolithic. Researchers cannot generalize the desires and behaviors of all faculty members. Nonetheless, many faculty members, presumably in schools of education, as well as liberal arts and social sciences, and even some in the hard sciences, by virtue of their disciplines, most likely do not agree with the dictates of neoliberalism that have been mandated for them by PBF 2.0 policies (Giroux, 2011; Mallot et al., 2013). Presumably, some faculty members would have an interest in challenging faulty neoliberal truth regimes.

Yet, we know that faculty members are at the bottom of the vertical hierarchies and do not have the power to act outside of these hierarchies, as the PBF 2.0 policies have

---

made sure. One method for faculty members to make information dissemination and identification of RBOs part of their goal is by writing information dissemination into their departmental strategic plans (Cooper, 2013).

While any university department can engage in CKM, schools of education may offer one of the best avenues for pursuing CKM. As highlighted earlier, education is not a discipline in the traditional sense, but rather a field because education has no set framework (Berliner, 2002; Labree, 1998). As a field, educational researchers have the freedom to integrate the insights from a variety of disciplines to augment their findings. Education departments can utilize this freedom to create new forms of knowledge and criticize social institutions (Gutierrez & Penua, 2014; Marginson et al; 2010; Schoenfield & Burkhardt, 2003; Weiman, 2014). In addition, education departments train future teachers, which may be the most important position in the university (Hill, 2006). Education departments can begin to identify their own strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and challenges and determine how they can best

disseminate their ideas and to whom (Bryson, 2004). Strategic planning, by pursuing goals of justice, can become a process of empowerment and liberation for those affected by the plans (Self-reference 2).

For instance, poverty reduction could become a plank of strategic plans. The method for pursuing poverty reduction does not just entail reducing tuition as the policymakers have it. Strategic planners can address the root of the problem and aim to alleviate the social conditions which cause poverty by working with RBO have and sites of social practice. Faculty members, academic departments, and students could pursue research on poverty reduction and actively share this research with K-12 schools, civic, and philanthropic organizations. Poverty reduction is complex, and higher education institutions produce much needed information and research to tackle this problem, but the information must be disseminated to parties and citizens who can utilize it. The empowerment of certain social actors, actors who traditionally do not have power to advocate for themselves, such as those in poverty, can be

---

a powerful method in facilitating the creation of a more vibrant public good and newer more complex social bonds between citizens (Fromm, 1956; Fitzsimmons & Uusiautti, 2013; Putnam, 2000).

Instructors can then mobilize student researchers and student teachers to bring their critical knowledge into their places of work. Faculty and students can bring their knowledge to school boards, county governments, and state legislators. Further, faculty, students, and other interested parties can forge and sustain membership in civic organizations. Researchers can forge horizontal networks with science departments in universities, private science foundations, environmental organizations, humanitarian organizations and government officials to advocate for more just uses of STEM and STEM training. There are literally endless possibilities for CKM and the forging of new networks to challenge the neoliberal truth regime. The forging of networks can be a lever of power to challenge the formal power of policymakers (Bohman & Deal, 2008). CKM may be able to forge the links of a global democracy which transcends national borders

(McGrew, 2002). In the widest sense, this global democracy can be considered Jeffersonian, as it will allow multiple actors greater access not only to their own society, but perhaps to an emerging global society as well (Giroux, 2011). These actors can utilize the networks of global civil society (Kaldor, 2000). From these networks, social actors can act civically toward a global public good. These various horizontal linkages between universities, RBO's and sites of practice will take very different forms as they are created amongst different populations in different regions.

Some of the activities that I am advocating for already occur. For instance, during the decade of the 2000s, The National Forum on Higher Education and Public Good, The Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan and the Kettering Foundation led a series of talks and meetings with residents of Brightmoor Michigan, which is largely an urban, poverty stricken neighborhood of Detroit. The effort led to increased civic participation from the residents of Brightmoor, in the form of attending public meetings, creating new



---

civic organizations and becoming active in local politics (Joslin & Burkhardt, 2011). Another example involved a group of interdisciplinary scholars from the University of Montana, UC Riverside, Chief Dull Knife Community College, and a Malian Agricultural College working Malian villagers in Africa to prevent and stop the spread of Ebola (Dunkel & George, 2011). These examples represent a good start to CKM, but in order to challenge the truth regime of neoliberalism and neo-conservatism, more critical efforts will be needed.

CKM, as opposed to KM, advocates for higher education institutions to foster *deliberate* and *coordinated* action between various institutions, organizations, RBO's and sites of practice to challenge neoliberal and neoconservative truth regimes and to shape the public good of various glo-na-cal networks and produce global public goods in these networks. CKM recognizes that human bonding and social cohesiveness are bound up with information production, dissemination and interpretation. Thus, CKM can be a method to synthesize the human individual and the production,

dissemination and interpretation of information. As a synthesis, CKM can also be praxis, the combining of theory and action. Education cannot just lead to action without a corresponding theoretical component. Rather, social action must be informed by calculated and empirical research and theories. This deliberate and coordinated effort to challenge injustice is central to CKM. Truth regimes and injustices must be recognized and challenged. One way to accomplish this is by creating empirical methods such as the ones outlined earlier understand how the public good of a region is shaped. Only then can the public good be challenged with praxis.

By bringing research and findings to practitioners, policymakers, and most importantly, parties that can pressure policymakers, higher education institutions can actively shape the public good. This vision of the public good, as examined in the last section, is one rooted in global creation and the creation of global public goods. The essence of CKM is not only the creation of knowledge, but the actual use and implementation of this knowledge.

---

Moreover, CKM can become a political mechanism to help diverse groups, some with limited power, some with no power, to negotiate the public good and mitigate public “bads.” As Sandler (1999) notes, scholars must also pay attention to how public goods and bads in the present will affect later generations. Will a public good in the present become a public bad for a later generation? Scholars must examine the impact of public goods and bads not just for the present, but posterity as well.

In the widest sense, CKM can help higher education be truly accountable, not just to market, but to the wider social and democratic needs of states, regions and even globally. CKM may even be able to lead a gradual revolution by cultivating the inherent possibilities for connection and change that exist in our glo-na-cal networks (Berman, 1988; Hedges, 2013). This revolution could usher in a new phase of the public good and global democracy.

### **CKM, Students and Faculty**

The space for justice must start with students; both undergraduate and graduate.

Students must create this space. Undergraduate students should be encouraged to debate in class. Professors could act as passionate facilitators and encourage students to actually think about neo-liberalism’s effect on their education and their society as well as failed attempts by the left and public organizations. Students could also be encouraged to create newsletters or websites either for graded work or extracurricular work. With the use of social media all students on campus could be encouraged to submit ideas. The idea is to get students involved in major discussions on morality.

An important factor in ensuring that knowledge is not repressive when involved in discussions is to beware of polemics. Foucault (1983) argued that to engage in polemics is to go into a discussion with a preconceived notion of what is correct and what is not. Foucault maintained that one has to engage with another, especially one who holds opposite views, in order to reach some sort of truth. Faculty and students would do well to follow this dictum. Even left wing scholars can become dogmatists if they are not willing to engage in

---

conversation and seek truth.

More than just class discussions however, students must mobilize their knowledge and actually use it. If students are taught to use their knowledge to promote the public good and to simply make life better and more just for people, this may be an effective method to push against the repressiveness inherent in the creation of knowledge. One way to inspire hope is for professors to take their students to local town and school board meetings. This should not be read as call to make students partisan. Rather, students must be inspired to follow their own callings- even if those ideas are in stark contrast to their professors. Students in all disciplines and fields can use their knowledge and learning to pressure local officials and professors in many disciplines can promote this. Service learning can be utilized (Lattuca & Stark, 2009). Colleges and departments can even set up class grades as service projects for interested students. Encouraging students to work for the public good can inspire a sense of hope and love in students. Attending town meetings is only one option however.

The results from the research methods from above should be utilized as coursework. The research above can help to shed light on new public goods that are needed, as well as existing ones that must be strengthened, and which actors should be responsible for remedying public bads. The research above can also attempt to strengthen bonds between citizens by actually teaching altruism, empathy, love and social capital, as well as techniques to promote these ideas. One way to teach empathy outlined by Kohn (1990) is perspective taking, where students must practice understanding how different people see the world. These discussions and research projects between faculty and students should be one of the foundations of higher education and the public good.

Working towards new visions of public goods and the public good, not simple credentials such as a diploma or the lure of a well-paying job, also speaks to Erikson's stages of human development. Most student development theorists concentrate on the fourth stage, the formation of identity (Evans et al., 2010). Yet CKM, while building identity and self-worth, can be used to allow students to achieve social and

---

political goals and in the widest sense a sense of accomplishment. Erikson argued that as young adults mature, they start to seriously contemplate the things they have achieved in their life and what legacy they will leave. Similarly, Keagan (1994) argued that students usually come into college at phase 3, the socialized mind, where they look to others to formulate their self-image and worth. By encouraging students to become active, to create new ideas and disseminate them, this can greatly aid in their development, in their identity and self-worth, and may give them something to be proud of later in life. A consumer driven culture does not encourage achievement, just consumption. Yet achievement, rooted in self-development can perhaps act as an antidote to consumerism.

Fostering a sense of achievement, especially achievement aimed at social ills, can also help students to achieve Keagan (1994) and Baxter Magolda's (2009) phase 4 of self-authorship. By using their knowledge in a practical way to effect change, even locally, students can start a global chain reaction, enhance the public good and develop individually. Attention to human

development can also help to promote empower/knowledge by highlighting the creative and transformative capabilities of knowledge. Along with individual growth, social growth and progression result as well.

The point is that popular pressure for change can affect the way global elites handle their business and affairs. We must never lose sight of the fact that global pressure is a weapon. CKM is meant to harness this weapon and not just use information in a defensive manner, but use it to empower those without a say and change the way organizations function and ultimately, to shape the public good in ways which are more beneficial to a majority of the world's population.

### **Conclusion**

Much of what I have proposed does take place in higher education and in other disciplines. Yet, the process is fragmented. As a new field, I am proposing cohesiveness for these activities and foundations. This new field I am proposing reflects a new aspect of the human condition. In a wider sense, the creation of this new field is a reflection of human progress. Berman

---

(1988) argues that modernity (note that he does not recognize postmodernity) is violent, frightening and in constant flux. Yet, despite all this, or rather because of the flux, modernity is flush with opportunities for progress. The creation of a new field, the public good in higher education may be one way to utilize these inherent opportunities. It also may be an effective way to chart a course between the Scylla and Charybdis of neoliberalism and postmodernism by recognizing the inherent oppressiveness of knowledge and putting knowledge to liberatory uses in the age of neoliberalism.

---

### References

- Adorno, T. (1973). *Negative dialectics*. Translated by EB Ashton. New York, NY: Continuum Press.
- Allan, E. (2011). *Policy discourses, gender, and education: Constructing women's status*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alexander, K. (2000). The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 411-430.
- Andenoro, A. (2013). The inaugural national leadership education research agenda: A new direction for the field. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 12(1), 1-9.
- Ball, S., Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Hoskins, K. (2011). Policy subjects and policy actors in schools: Some necessary but insufficient analyses. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(4), 611-624.
- Bambrough, R. (2003). *Introduction to Aristotle's Politics*. New York, NY: Signet Classic.
- Barnetson, B & Cutright, M. (2000). Performance indicators as conceptual technologies. *Higher Education*, 40, 277-292.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor: The University of Press Michigan.
- Baxter Magolda, M., & King, P. (2012), Nudging minds to life: Self-authorship as a foundation for learning. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 38, 1-138. doi: 10.1002/aehe.20003
- Baxter Magolda, M. (2009). *Authoring your life: Developing an INTERNAL VOICE to navigate life's challenges*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bell, D. (1999). *The coming of post-industrial society: A venture in social forecasting* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). New York, NY: Basic Books Publishers.
- Bess & Dee (2008). *Organizational Culture. College and University Organizations: Effective Policy and Practice*.
- Berliner, D. (2002). Educational research: The hardest science of all. *Educational Researcher*, 31, 18-20.
- Berman, M. (1988). *All that is solid melts into air: The experience of modernity*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Bloland, H. (1995). Postmodernism and

- higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(5), 521-559.
- Boland, H. (2005). Whatever happened to postmodernism in higher education?: No requiem in the new millennium. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(2), 121-150.
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195-203.
- Bok, D. (2013). *Higher education in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bowen, H. (1996). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Transaction publishers.
- Bryson, J. (2004). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations: A guide to strengthening and sustaining organizational achievement* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Buber, M. (1970). *I and thou*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Burke, J. (2002). *Funding public colleges and universities for performance*. Albany, NY: Rockefeller Institute Press.
- Burke, J. (2005). The many faces of accountability. In J. Burke (Eds.), *Achieving Accountability in Higher Education* (pp. 1-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burkhardt, H. & Schoenfeld, A. (2003). "Improving educational research: Toward a more useful, more influential, and better-funded enterprise." *Educational Researcher*, 32, 3-14.
- Calhoun, C. (1998). *The public good as a social and cultural project*. In W. Powell & E. Clemens (Eds.), *Private action and the public good* (pp. 20-37). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Castells, M. (2000). End of millennium. In D. Held and A. McGrew (Eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (430-439). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cooper, A., Levin, B. & Campbell, C (2009). The growing (but still limited) importance of evidence in education policy and practice. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10, 159- 171.
- Cooper, A., Levin, B. (2013). Research use by leaders in Canadian school districts. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 8(7) 1-15.
- Cooper, A. (2014). Knowledge mobilisation in education across Canada: a cross-case analysis of 44 research brokering organisations. *Evidence & Policy*, 10(1), 29-59.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important?

- 
- Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7-20.
- DeGraw, D. (2014). *The economics of revolution*. New York, NY: Verso Press.
- Dunkel, F., Shams, A., & George, C. (2011). Expansive collaboration: A model for transformed classrooms, community-based research and service learning. *NACTA Journal*, 12, 65-74.
- Erikson, E. (1985). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Evans, N., Forney, D., Guido, F., Patton, L. & Renn, K. (2010). *Student development in college: Theory, research and practice*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. New York, NY: Longman
- Feuerbach, L. (2006). *The essence of Christianity*. New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Press.
- FitzSimmons, R., & Uusiautti, S. (2013). Critical revolutionary pedagogy spiced by pedagogical love. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(3), 240-253.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1983). *Polemics, politics, and problematizations*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Friedman, M., & Friedman R. (1981). *Free to choose: A personal statement*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.
- Fromm, E. (1956). *The art of loving*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Fuentes-Nieva, T., Galasso, N. (2014). *Working for the few: Political capture and economic inequality*. Oxfam GB: Oxfam International.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Giroux, H. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gramsci, A. (1992). *Prison Notebooks, Vol. I*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Greenwood, D. (1997). New developments in the intergenerational impact of education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27, 503-510.
- Gutierrez, K., & Penuel, W. (2014). Relevance to practice as a Criterion for Rigor. *Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 19-23.
- Habermas, J. (1990). *Modernity: An unfinished project*. In *Critical Theory: The Essential Readings*, edited by David Ingram and Julia Simon-Ingram. New York, NY: Paragon
- Hall, R. (2013). Educational technology and the enclosure of academic labor inside higher education. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(3), 52-82.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford

---

University Press.

- Hatch, M. & Cunliffe, T. (2006). *Organizational Theory: Modern, Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy environment. *Higher Education* 49, 155-176.
- Hill, D. (2012). Immiseration capitalism, activism and education: Resistance, revolt and revenge. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10, 1-53.
- Jay, M. (1996). *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt school and the institute of social research, 1930-1950*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Joslin, J. & Burkhardt, J. (2011). Promoting democratic practice in the context of an extended university-community partnership: Lessons from participant interviews and observations over five years. The Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1-38.
- Kaldor, M. (2000). Global civil society. In D. Held and A. McGrew (Eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (559-563). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kegan, R. (1994). *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kohn, A. (1990). *The brighter side of human nature: Altruism and empathy in everyday life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kincheloe, J. (2007). Critical pedagogy: Where are we now? In P. McLaren and J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 9-42). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Klein, N. (2007). *The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Kleinbard, N. (2014). *We are better than this*. New York, NY: Oxford Press.
- Labree, D. (1998). Educational researchers: Living with a lesser form of knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 30, 2-9.
- Lambert, M. (2014). *Privatization and the public good: Public universities in the balance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lattuca, L. R. & Stark, J. S. (2009). *Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- MacDonald, L. (2013). In their own words: U. S. think tank “experts” and the framing of educational policy debates. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(3), 1-30.
- Mallot, C., Hill, D. & Banfield, G. (2013). Neoliberalism, immiseration capitalism and the historical urgency of a socialist education, *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(4), 1-24.
- Mansbridge, J. (1998). On the contested nature of the public good. In W. Powell and E. Clemens. (Eds.), *Private*



- 
- Action and the Public Good* New (pp. 3-19). Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Marginson, S. (2007). "The public/private divide in higher education: A global revision." *Higher Education*, 53, 307-333.
- Marginson, S., & Rhoads, G. (2002). Beyond nation states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43, 301-309.
- Marginson, S., Murphy, P., & Peters M. (2010). *Global creation: Space, mobility and synchrony in the age of the knowledge economy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Martin, L. (1999). Political economy of international cooperation. In I. Kaul, I. Grunberg & M. Stern (Ed.), *Global public goods: International cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 51-64). New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme.
- McClendon, M. & Hearn, J. (2013). The resurgent interest in performance-based funding for higher education academe. 41, 1-13.
- McGrew, A. (2002). Models of transnational democracy. In D. Held and A. McGrew (Eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate* (500-513). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- McMahon, W. (2009). Higher learning, greater good: The private and social benefits of higher education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mertens, D. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Miller, D. (2001). Distributing responsibilities. In Pogge, T., and Horton K. (Eds.), *Global Ethics: Seminal essays* (pp. 481-506), St. Paul, MN: Paragon Press.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organizations*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.) Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the public university: The forty year assault on the middle class*. Quincy, MA: Harvard University Press. .
- Oancea, A., Engelbrecht, P. & Hoffman, J. (2009). Research policy and governance in the United Kingdom-Critical perspective and implications for South African higher education research. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 23(6), 1101-1114.
- O'Neill, O. (1987). Rights, obligations and world hunger. In Pogge and Horton, K (Ed.), *Global ethics: Seminal essays*. (pp. 139-156). St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.
- Phenix, P. (1986). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Phillips, D. (2014). Research in the hard sciences, and in very hard "softer" domains. *Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 9-10.
- Plant, R. (2010). *The Neoliberal state*. United Kingdom: Oxford University

- Press.
- Pogge, T., & Horton, K. (2008). *Preface*. In Pogge, T., and Horton K. (Eds.), *Global ethics: Seminal essays* (pp. xiii-xxiii), St. Paul, MN: Paragon Press.
- Prokou, E. (2013). Equity and efficiency in Greek higher education policies in the past three decades: A shift of emphasis to the issue of efficiency/"quality assurance" in the 2000s. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(3), 29-51.
- Pusser, B. (2006). The role of public spheres. In Tierney, G., (Eds.), *Governance and the Public Good* (pp. 1-20), Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Rabinow, P. (1984). *Introduction to the Foucault reader*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Rao, J. (2002). Equity in a global public goods framework. In I. Kaul, I. Grunberg & M. Stern (Ed.), *Global public goods: International cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 68-87). New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme.
- Rhoads, R., & Torres, C. (2006). *University, state and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas*. Palo Alto: Stanford Press.
- Richardson, R., & Smalling, T. (2005). Accountability and governance. In J. Burke (Ed.), *Achieving Accountability in Higher Education* (pp. 55-75). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rudolph, J. (2014). Why understanding science matters: The IES research guidelines as a case in point. *Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 15-18.
- Saarinen, T. (2008). Position of text and discourse analysis in higher education policy research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(6), 719-730.
- Scheffler, S. (1995). Individual responsibility in a global age. In Pogge, T., and Horton K. (Eds.), *Global Ethics: Seminal essays* (pp. 291-312), St. Paul, MN: Paragon Press.
- Scherrer, J. (2014). The role of the intellectual in eliminating the effects of poverty: A response to Tierney. *Educational Researcher*, 43(4), 201-207.
- Schulman, B. (2001). *The seventies: The great shift in American culture, society and politics*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Sen. A. (1988). The concept of development. In Pogge, T., and Horton K. (Eds.), *Global Ethics: Seminal essays* (pp. 157-180), St. Paul, MN: Paragon Press.
- Smith, A. (1998). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 330-353.
- Stanley, W. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Democratic realism, neoliberalism, conservatism and a tragic sense of*

---

education. In P. McLaren and J. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Critical Pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 371-390). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Wichita, Kansas. His research interests include the critical theory and postmodernism.

Sy, B. (1999). Global communication for a more equitable world. In I. Kaul, I. Grunberg & M. Stern (Ed.), *Global public goods: International cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (pp. 326-343). New York, NY: United Nations Development Programme.

Vedder, R. (2004). *Going broke by degree: Why college costs too much*. New York, NY: American Enterprise Institute.

Vestrich, R. (2008). The academy under siege: Threats to teaching and learning in American higher education. *American Academic*, 2, 55-71.

Walsh, J. (2008). The critical role discourse in education for democracy. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 6(2), 54-76.

Weiman, C. (2014). The similarities between research in education and research in the hard sciences. *Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 12-14.

Wolfe, A. (1998). *What is altruism?* In W. Powell and E. Clemens. (Eds.), *Private Action and the Public Good* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wolff, R. (2012). *Democracy at work: A cure for capitalism*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books

---

### **About the Author**

Dr. Angelo is an Assistant Professor of graduate education at Newman University in