

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

# The Changing Hidden Curriculum

### A Personal Recollection

ERIC MARGOLIS

---

Throughout my school years we were taught and practiced “duck and cover” in case of nuclear attack. I was in 9th grade when the Cuban Missile Crisis had everyone wondering if nuclear war was imminent; we were old enough to know that New York City would be ground zero and that hiding under our desks or going down to the basement would not save us. I was in 11th grade English class, perhaps discussing *A Separate Peace* by John Knowles, when the school loudspeakers came on with what sounded like random shouting. Finally, a voice broke through and announced that President Kennedy had been shot in Dallas. We were in a state of shock, many cried, school was dismissed. For two days nearly everyone in the country was glued to the television, we saw Jack Ruby shoot Lee Harvey Oswald. What was happening to our country? I took 11th grade biology from Anne Schwerner. Her son Michael was one of the civil rights activists registering Blacks to vote in Mississippi. Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman disappeared on June 21, 1964 and their bodies were not discovered for two months. I attended the memorial service at a temple in New Rochelle. We stood outside because there were so many mourners. In 1965 Malcolm X was assassinated in front of a huge crowd in Harlem; about two weeks later we watched TV in horror once again as Alabama State Troopers beat civil rights workers on a bridge in Selma, Alabama. The next day, quietly and away from the cameras, the first 3500 marines arrived in Vietnam as the United States began to take over the fight from the French. Civil rights and the war dominated my school years—as it did others of my generation.

I started college in 1965 at the State University of New York, New Paltz. Tuition was around \$100.00 a quarter and the hidden curricula in higher education could scarcely have been more different than it is today. In those days the need for growth in Higher Education in the United States was spurred by the cold war and the desire to “beat the Russians.” Within

a span of ten years the Soviets launched the first artificial satellite in Earth's orbit (*Sputnik* in 1957), the first animal in space (a dog in 1960), and the first human spaceman (Yuri Gagarin in 1961). Other things were happening. The GI Bill had proved successful in enrolling returning service men and women in college; their children, born from 1946 onward, were the "baby boom" and were reaching college age. In other words, higher education was a growth industry defined as a social benefit. As later, the U.S. worried about its post-war place in the world and growing competition from the Communist "bloc" wanted rocket scientists, engineers, and physicists, but also wanted to produce educated people fluent in foreign languages, history, foreign relations, sociology and anthropology who could serve as essential parts of the state ideological apparatus.<sup>1</sup> The United States clearly saw the need to project soft as well as hard power. Soft power like the Peace Corps and the "green revolution" worked hand in glove with the maintenance of a massive military presence in the countries defeated in World War II, Japan and Germany, but also Korea, the Philippines, and so on. Military and technological development in atomic weapons and rocketry continued at increasing levels in the projection of hard power.

During my four years in college, the State University of New York grew at an amazing pace, all supported by taxpayer funding. The Republican governor, Nelson Rockefeller, "was the driving force in turning the State University of New York into the largest system of public higher education in the United States. Under his governorship it grew from 29 campuses and 38,000 full-time students to 72 campuses and 232,000 full-time students" (State of New York, *Public Papers of Nelson A. Rockefeller*, Fifty-third Governor of the State of New York, vol. 15, 1973 Albany, NY: State of New York, 1973, p. 1380).<sup>1</sup>

The space race and global cold war competition underlay one (not so) hidden curriculum; there were others that were much harder to see. A holdover from past practices was the notion that colleges and universities were to act *in loco parentis*; that is, to act in the place of the parent. In real life this meant students, boys and girls as they were considered at the time, lived in sex segregated dormitories and were forbidden to visit one another's rooms except for an occasional Sunday visit when the halls were patrolled and curious rules enforced (doors open, three feet on the floor at all times. . .). Girls had to be in the dormitory by 11:00 pm on weekdays (maybe midnight on weekends), and no alcohol was permitted. A great amount of time and effort was invested by both sides of the morality play; the administration had systems of monitors to make sure the rules were obeyed, "boys and girls" developed elaborate ways to beat the system so they could have sex, signing each other in and out, meeting in the woods, getting motel rooms off campus. A similar struggle went on over alcohol. The legal age to drink in New York was 18 at the time, and shops in town were only too glad to sell to anyone with a driver's license—of course this meant the 18-year-old in the group would buy for everyone. Numerous schemes to smuggle booze into the dorms were successful. Simultaneously, and seemingly nationwide, college students discovered marijuana. This was something college and university administrators were not prepared for and it put them in a bind. On the one hand, *in loco parentis* suggested the duty to protect the students; on the other hand, this was not simple university rule breaking but rather federal rule breaking. Most college towns became, in effect, youth ghettos, places where the usual practices of law enforcement were suspended.

Another hidden curriculum was course requirements. At New Paltz, and many other colleges and universities, the entire freshman and sophomore years consisted of required classes that were considered foundational. Math, philosophy (mostly Greek), three terms of a foreign

language, introduction to psychology (I was planning to major in psychology; rats and T mazes pushed me to sociology), introduction to sociology, three terms of history—if I remember correctly they were U.S., World, and one you could choose. I took African history taught by a Nigerian professor. Three terms of literature—U.S. and World again, I think, and my choice of Asian literature. In any case it had been decided long ago that students’ brains had to be furnished with certain information and trained in certain ways of thinking—like a muscle that needed to be exercised. Only after the first two years were we allowed to pursue “elective” courses in our major. We received report cards, but there was no way for students to evaluate either courses or faculty.

Perhaps the most important “hidden” curriculum is right up there in the name “State University.” Buildings were built and owned by the state and paid for by willing taxpayers. The parents of the baby boomers, who had lived through the Depression and fought World War II, believed in education as a social benefit. They wanted their children to have the opportunities for higher education that before had been generally available only to the upper classes.<sup>2</sup> The universities cooperated with the state and federal governments in myriad ways, from small grants to subsidies for massive projects like the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory founded by the University of California in 1962 and funded by the Department of Energy. One visible presence on nearly every campus was the Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC), with an ancient heritage going back to the Morrill Act of 1862 that created the land-grant colleges and required military training as an element of the curriculum. Students receive a stipend or scholarship and take elective classes in military tactics. ROTC units were (and are today) often visible marching or practicing on the college or university training fields.

In an earlier anthology (Margolis 2001), my co-authors and I emphasized what Michael Apple called the “strong form of the hidden curriculum” which reproduced race, gender, and social class inequalities (Apple and King 1977).<sup>3</sup> In the introduction we also discussed various ways that curricula can be hidden. In the case of the curricula discussed above, they were hidden in plain sight:

In Edgar Allan Poe’s short story, “The Purloined Letter” a seasoned investigator has been called upon by the French police to lend his intuitive skills to solving a mystery. He asks the police about their search for critical clues: “I presume you looked to the mirrors, between the boards and the plates, and you probed the beds and the bed-clothes, as well as the curtains and carpets?” To which they reply: “Certainly; we opened every package and parcel; we not only opened every book, but we turned over every leaf in each volume. . . We also measured the thickness of every book-cover, with the most accurate admeasurement, and applied to each the most jealous scrutiny of the microscope. . .” The investigator continues: “You explored the floors beneath the carpets? And the paper on the walls? You looked into the cellars?” To which the police again affirm, “We did.” “Well then” speculates the investigator, “perhaps the mystery is a little too plain.”<sup>4</sup> In this sense some of the hidden curriculum is intentionally hidden in plain sight, precisely so that it will remain undetected (Margolis, Soldatenko, Acker, and Gair 2001).

In essence, while these elements of the hidden curriculum were well known to political decision makers, administration, and faculty they remained hidden to students as “just the way school was.” Students worked to subvert these structures, but did not confront them directly. This was soon to change. All that was hidden was revealed, challenged, and changed.

Cracks began to appear as tectonic plates shifted. If you were old enough at 18 to go to Vietnam, why couldn't you vote? Why was your girlfriend or boyfriend not able to visit your room? Why did you have to take a string of "meaningless" coursework when the world outside the ivory tower seemed to be going up in flames? Why were there so few Blacks, Puerto Ricans, or Chicanos on campus? Why were there no classes on civil rights, Black history, women's studies, or American involvement in foreign wars? Why did students not have the right to demonstrate on campus? TV and the glossy magazine photographs in *Time* and *Life* were central in spreading the war in Vietnam, brutality against the civil rights movement, and highlighted a growing student movement. In a remarkable short period of time many of the elements of the hidden curricula would be brought into the full glare of the media, challenged, and changed.

One of the first breakouts from the hidden curriculum of the university as an ivory tower (isolated and insulated from political life) took place as early as 1960 when four freshmen from the historically black land-grant university, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University in Greensboro, sat down at the "white's only" lunch counter in Woolworth's, ordered cups of coffee, and refused to leave when ordered to do so. They stayed all day and the following day. The number of students "sitting-in" reached 20 or more; it was up to 60 the next day. The students were attacked by whites who poured ketchup and other food on them, and sometimes beat them physically. Nevertheless, the movement spread rapidly to other cities and other segregated corporations. Eventually, financial pressure, the power of non-violent resistance, and national television coverage forced many national corporations to end Jim Crow practices.

In the same year that the sit-ins began in earnest, The Sharon Statement was written by a group of young conservative activists. The name was drawn from the name of William F. Buckley's estate in Sharon, Connecticut, and the statement was the founding document for Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). Articulating what they termed "transcendent values" the statement supported individualism ("God-given free will"), small government, the market economy, and most intensely the existential threat of "international Communism" arguing that the "United States should stress victory over, rather than co-existence with this menace."<sup>5</sup>

In 1962 a meeting was held at Port Huron, Michigan. Attendees were mostly student activists from the left; many were from the labor and civil rights movement, including Tom Hayden, who was a secretary for Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The manifesto written at that meeting came to be called the Port Huron Statement. It rallied against alienation and the emphasized need for political activism in support of civil rights and against the cold War ideology that produced fear of nuclear annihilation.<sup>6</sup> It was addressed primarily at apathetic, middle-class, white, and privileged youths, many of whom were, or would soon become, college students. SDS stood for "A free university in a free society." A central argument was that "the American political system is not the democratic model of which its glorifiers speak. In actuality it frustrates democracy by confusing the individual citizen, paralyzing policy discussion, and consolidating the irresponsible power of military and business interests."<sup>7</sup>

The Sharon Statement and the Port Huron Statement set the internal political battles in the United States well into the 21st century. Battles took place on campuses as well as in the general body politic (Klatch 1999).

What had begun as ideological doctrine from both left and right soon morphed into practice. The 1964/65 free speech movement (FSM) at the University of California Berkeley galvanized and politicized students across the country, and baffled school administrators. Like

the “sit-ins” the student movement also started as a small-scale event and rapidly grew into a national movement for student power that eventually exposed and then eliminated the *in loco parentis* curriculum. In October 1964 a Berkeley dean announced that students could no longer set up tables to advocate or collect money for “outside” political organizations other than the national Democratic or Republican parties. Jack Weinberg, a former graduate student, was sitting at the table supporting CORE (The Congress of Racial Equality). When Jack failed to show his ID card to the campus police he was arrested and put in a police car. Thousands of students spontaneously surrounded the police car in which Weinberg was detained, and the car did not move for 32 hours. As he continued his one man sit-in, speaker after speaker stood on top of the police car to advocate for free speech. The most famous speech was made on the Sproul Hall steps on December 2, 1964 by a student activist and civil rights worker, Mario Savio:

There’s a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious—makes you so sick at heart—that you can’t take part. You can’t even passively take part. And you’ve got to put your bodies upon the gears and upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus, and you’ve got to make it stop. And you’ve got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you’re free, the machine will be prevented from working at all.<sup>8</sup>

In the next stage of the developing demonstration thousands of students occupied Sproul Hall; they sat-in in shifts and attended classes, including newly organized “teach-ins” where free speech, civil rights, and the beginning of the Vietnam War were openly discussed. On December 4th almost 800 students in Sproul Hall were arrested, but most were released on their own recognizance. The University chose to file more serious charges against those whom they perceived as “leaders.” In response, Cal students basically shut down the University and the administration backed down. Political organizing was “allowed;” the FSM and branches of SDS spread to other campuses and many of the old *in loco parentis* rules fell. College students came into their own as “adults” free to express opinions, eventually evaluating their courses and professors, living in co-ed dorms, and so on.

American involvement in the Vietnam War increased steadily, and television brought it into every living room and dormitory. On the right the war was perceived as an essential battle against the Communist menace. On the left the war was seen as an imperialist adventure that served the interests of the Military Industrial Complex that a Republican President and hero of World War II, Dwight Eisenhower, had warned against in his farewell address. Ike was concerned that revolving doors and tight relationships between Congress, the military, and huge defense contractors would create a permanent wartime state.<sup>9</sup>

Two of the reasons the Vietnam War became a flashpoint on campus were first the draft, and second the concern that instead of being “free” the university was increasingly entangled with the military industrial complex—not only in huge investments like the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, but in myriad small grants to individual professors and campus laboratories. The role of the hidden curriculum of relations between a university supposedly dedicated to the open pursuit of knowledge, and a university that many saw as an arm of a permanent wartime state, became highly visible and increasingly contentious.

As the war escalated the draft became the most obvious element of the once hidden curriculum. From the beginning college students had been given draft deferments. This separated middle-class males from their working-class brethren and caused many to go to college who

might not have otherwise. In 1966 the government went one step too far by requiring students to take an achievement type test called the “student draft deferment test.” Presumably the intent was to separate “worthy” students from those who were escaping the draft. On campuses across the country there was massive resistance to the very concept; many refused to take the exam and many picketed the testing sites. The “test” was only offered once. But it opened a window on the relationship between the university and the military. Sacred cows like ROTC came to be questioned, and in many cases were moved off campus.

## The Hidden Curricula Change

There is neither space here, nor need, to write about the turbulent history of the 1960s and early 70s. Instead, I will turn to the direct effect of the political battles on hidden curricula in the university. It has been said that the right won the political war while the left won the cultural war. In university politics there is much truth in this observation. Hippies and leftist students brought sex, drugs, and rock and roll on campus and organized anti-war, civil rights, and student power marches, demonstrations, and human be-ins. But Ronald Reagan was elected Governor of California, at least partly by promising to clean up “the mess at Berkeley.” Clark Kerr, as Chancellor of the California system, sought to protect protesting students from being expelled, and was fired for being “too lenient” by the conservative board of regents.<sup>10</sup> Nonetheless, there would be no return to a university acting as surrogate parents and policing student morality. Nor would the nexus of university research with the military be interrupted; instead it grew and strengthened.

Required coursework, general education requirements, had long been stakes in a struggle between “traditionalists” who believed certain courses were essential scaffolding for a higher education degree and “progressives” who thought students should have freedom of choice to decide on their educational interests. Famously, the University of Chicago and Columbia University had the most rigorous core requirements while Cornell and Brown led in open enrolment and student-driven courses. In undergraduate education the number of required core courses tended to shrink as an agreement was reached between those who saw school as a path to employment and those who saw higher education as a place for intellectual experimentation and advocated for freedom of choice. While their goals were disparate, they agreed that two years of required credit hours was too much.<sup>11</sup>

As the old hidden agendas and practices were exposed by new generations of scholars, and by students no longer content to simply follow along, it became essential for the University to find new ways to hide many elements of the curriculum once again. Accusations of racism, classism, and sexism and a long history of discriminatory practices by faculty “good old boy” networks were dealt with by two developments: affirmative action in student recruitment and faculty hiring and the development of interdisciplinary studies, such as ethnic and women’s studies programs.

Beginning in 1961 the term “affirmative action” began to be used in programs designed, among other things, to open educational opportunities for students of color and to increase the presence of women on campus.<sup>12</sup> Admissions in most colleges and universities had been truly a hidden process in which SAT or other test scores were used, but there was ample room for individual faculty and admission committees to make selections based on unspoken criteria. In the Ivy Leagues and other prestigious institutions “legacy” admissions were (and are)

common; i.e., students whose parents had attended the same institution were far more likely to be admitted. Even if not discriminatory on purpose, these policies had the effect of producing incoming classes homogeneous in terms of race, social class, and gender. Students of color and those from blue-collar backgrounds, older students, or students who were the first in their family to attend college, faced barriers to admission as well as to success in attaining degrees. Certain majors—engineering, math, and the non-biological sciences—tended to have gendered hidden curricula: a perceived hostility that marginalized women.<sup>13</sup> Universities set up offices of affirmative action that monitored admissions procedures and outcomes. The goal was to eliminate barriers to under-represented groups and make admissions policies transparent.

Affirmative action programs produced a counter-narrative among conservative faculty and students that students of color or women would not have been admitted “on their own academic merits.” Affirmative action was seen as “reverse discrimination” in which more qualified white males were denied admission to provide room for the underqualified in the name of political correctness. Alternately, it was said by some that well-qualified women and students of color would suffer from the stigma of being perceived as “affirmative action” cases (Bloom 1987; Rodriguez [1982] 1983; Steal 1991; Sykes 1988). Both sides recognized that mostly hidden admissions and hiring practices shaped the faculty and student body—indeed the university itself. This battle has been fought in scholarship and in the courts for more than half a century with opposing sides having been largely determined by the Sharon and Port Huron ideological statements.

Simultaneously, efforts from inside and outside the university created whole new departments and programs with their own formal and hidden curricula. Women’s studies, Black studies, Chicano studies, and Asian/Pacific Islander studies programs struggled to be established—often with pressure on university administrations from community action groups. The names of ethnic studies programs changed as political word usage change; e.g., Black studies became African American Studies (and now at ASU, African and African American Studies; Chicana/o Studies was re-branded Transborder Studies<sup>14</sup>). More or less at the same time, existing course work in history, the social sciences, and humanities began to change the formal curriculum to include untold (hidden) stories of workers, women, immigrants, and minority groups. Alongside these developments grew a conservative whispering campaign and eventually a literature that these programs were “crap courses” that they were anti-male, anti-white people—in essence that they had created their own hidden curriculum of discriminatory practices (Bloom 1987; Sykes 1988; Steal 1991). In an interesting analysis of the development of Chicano Studies programs, Michael Soldatenko pointed out that what actually happened was that the new programs were disciplined by the academy. Programs sought to become departments, faculty held each other up to “rigorous” tenure and promotion policies, for example downgrading publications in “Chicano” journals in favor of mainstream disciplinary journals in the social sciences or humanities (Soldatenko 1998, 1999).

Often, instead of disestablishing good old boy networks, parallel good old girl and ethnic studies networks were developed. The hidden curriculum of race and gender had become far less visible, but it did not disappear. Nonetheless, the routinization of these new academic disciplines took much of the fury out of civil rights attacks on the academy.

The anti-war movements that sprang from the war in Vietnam and later Cambodia were perhaps an even bigger threat to hidden curricula that connected the “multiversity” to the growing military industrial congressional complex. As the war raged on there were repeated

calls to move ROTC off campus and many universities did just that, e.g., Harvard in 1969 and Stanford in 1971. (Even when the war ended, the anti-ROTC policy continued in objection to the “don’t ask, don’t tell” policy for gays in the military that President Clinton instituted in 1993.) It had been the practice for recruiters from each branch of the armed services to come to campuses and set up tables to promote their branch and induce college students to enlist. Demonstrators blocked the tables, chanted anti-war slogans, and in some cases sprayed blood on the recruiters. They became a flash point. Student demonstrators also confronted the draft directly—chanting “hell no, we won’t go” and burning their draft cards.

The long-term solution to this, both for the government and for academia, was the so-called “All Volunteer Army.” Nixon had promised to end the draft in his 1968 campaign and five years later this became a reality. The brute fact that middle-class college students no longer had to fear being drafted was a brilliant strategy in reducing opposition to wars the U.S. entered into. In effect it depoliticized the campus. While the “Shock and Awe” attack on Iraq did provoke widespread anti-war demonstrations, they had neither the impact nor the holding power of the Vietnam protests.<sup>15</sup> As the hidden curriculum of links between colleges/universities and the military became less and less visible once again, no campuses were shut down; no administration building occupied. After 40 years, in 2011 Harvard welcomed back ROTC.<sup>16</sup>

The morality of military support for university research had been controversial at least since World War II and the development of the atomic bomb. The SDS call for “a free university in a free society” implied opposition to secret research projects. The very notion of “science” requires open publishing of results so that they can be “replicated” and tested. Secret science is an oxymoron. Similarly, there was awareness and much criticism of the CIA sponsorship of social science research in the Cold War, counter-insurgency, and wars of national liberation, as well as domestic spying programs in the U.S. like COINTELPRO. Many academics learned through the Freedom of Information Act and the multi-volume “Church Report” that they had been the subject of warrantless surveillance by the FBI and CIA (United States Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities).<sup>17</sup> In the recent wars in the Mid-east and Central Asia the U.S. army recruited U.S. academics—anthropologists and other social scientists—into what they termed “the Human Terrain System.” They were to be “embedded” with Army units to “recruit, train, deploy, and support an embedded operationally focused socio-cultural capability; conduct operationally relevant socio-cultural research and analysis; develop and maintain a socio-cultural knowledge base, in order to enable operational decision-making, enhance operational effectiveness, and preserve and share socio-cultural institutional knowledge.”<sup>18</sup> Much university research is now privately funded by large electronics, pharmaceutical, and other corporations with patent and intellectual property rights negotiated between the university administration and the funding corporation. In increasingly common practice, open publication of research findings is becoming tightly controlled as “trade secrets.”

Above and beyond the ongoing relations between academia and the Military Industrial Complex, the single most important change in the hidden curriculum in higher education was a change in the publically perceived mission of the institution. Where education during the cold war era was seen as a broad social benefit and state colleges and universities perceived as public goods, a college education came to be defined as a personal benefit. In good or bad economic times state legislatures began to cut back on their contributions to higher education. Pell Grants, based on need, were increasingly replaced by a system of government-backed

loans. Pell Grants, which do not have to be repaid, are capped at \$5,500 for the 2011 school year. The cost of tuition has been rising steadily. According to the College Board:

Public four-year colleges charge, on average, \$7,605 per year in tuition and fees for in-state students. The average surcharge for full-time out-of-state students at these institutions is \$11,990. Private nonprofit four-year colleges charge, on average, \$27,293 per year in tuition and fees. Tuition is only a portion of college costs; on top of that one must add costs such as living expenses, texts, and supplies. Thus, there is an increasing gap between what the Pell Grant might cover and the cost of college, a gap increasingly covered by loans; some are direct federally financed low-interest loans, others like the Federal Family Education Loan Program are made by private banks but backed by the government.<sup>19</sup> According to the *Atlantic*, student loans have grown by 511% since 1999.<sup>20</sup>

In a modern version of the GI Bill, universities increasingly saw their mission as a higher sort of vocational education; and students were expected to reap individual rewards by getting advanced degrees. However, unlike the GIs, many went deeply into debt to attain those degrees. According to *Forbes*:

. . . one out of every 10 students who graduated from four-year colleges and universities in 2008 (the most recent year for which data is available) owed \$40,000 or more in loans, according to the Institute for College Access and Success. Overall more than two-thirds (67%) of students earning degrees from those institutions carried loan debt, owing an average \$23,200.<sup>21</sup>

One of my Education students (who will remain anonymous) wrote this, summarizing the desperation of students, especially those in the low-wage “helping” professions like teaching and social work:

1 semester of doctoral tuition at ASU=\$5,000. My yearly salary as a high school teacher—less than \$40,000. The possibility that I will get to mentor a student teacher for the Spring semester that will cover the cost of 6 credit hours—priceless! (fingers crossed)

With debts piling up, students were basically eliminated as a threat to the status quo; they were unlikely to be demonstrating against wars, or for civil or any other rights. As students and their parents assumed a much greater share of the educational cost, students began to see themselves as consumers of a service—eroding “pedagogical authority” and contributing to grade inflation.<sup>22</sup> In some ways challenging the notion that the “professor was always right” helped balance the hidden curricula of the ivory tower, but as with anyone who is paying for a service, student/consumers expected not only to be served “education” but also to be entertained in ways that George Ritzer and others termed McDonaldization. In the McUniversity students “. . . see themselves as consumers of education in much the same way as they are consumers in the mall (including the cybermall)” (Ritzer 2002, p. 19). Ritzer termed McUniversities “cathedrals of consumption.” He argued (as Max Weber would have) that they are also rational bureaucratic structures that simultaneously produce disenchantment (Ritzer 2002, p. 20). To counter disenchantment, McUniversities create three kinds of spectacle:

1. The creation of simulations—“elaborate fakes, designed to amaze and delight consumers”—because “the real, the authentic, is difficult to work with.”

2. “Implosion” which “involves the elimination of boundaries between extant phenomena so that they collapse in on one another.” His example is the way that theme parks and malls became one and the same in places like The Mall of America—in “The New American University” dormitories have become country clubs (discussed below).

3. “The manipulation of time and space.” Time compression means that things that used to take weeks, say writing a research paper, can be done in an evening (nothing in that statement implies quality.) A final component of McDonaldization is “edutainment”:

. . . classes taught by closed circuit television or online make it possible for students across the country to take courses at a given university. These courses can be taken. . . at the leisure of the student. And universities pour funds into building immense facilities such as stadiums and athletic centers with the attention of attracting students. (Ritzer 2002, pp. 20, 21)

## **McDonaldization of Higher Education: The New American University as a Case in Point**

Full disclosure: I am an Associate Professor at Arizona State University (ASU), and have been teaching here since 1995; I speak from experience and the experiences of my colleagues and students. In 2002 Michael M. Crow took over as president of Arizona State University (ASU) and immediately set about employing the “shock doctrine” borrowed from business designed to disrupt the hidden curricula of university culture.<sup>23</sup> Curiously, when many businesses are moving to diffuse models that employ distributed web-like structures and social media, ASU and the Arizona Board of Regents chose to impose a command and control structure reminiscent of the old factory system. Using a variety of means, Crow sought to disrupt and eliminate cultural practices including faculty governance (already weakened to “shared governance”) and the structure of discipline-based departments, and replace the traditional diffused and loosely coupled power with a top-down control model. He circulated a pamphlet to deans and department heads produced by a private management firm, Dallas-based Pritchett & Associates, titled *High-Velocity Cultural Change: A Handbook for Managers*. The opening lines read:

Your approach to changing the culture should be highly out of character for the organization. Choose methods that stand in stark contrast to standard operating procedures. From the very outset you must free yourself from the existing culture and conceive a plan of action that starts to liberate the organization from its past. (Pritchett and Pound 1993, p. 3)

High velocity destruction of university culture and replacing it with a command and control hierarchy were essential to McDonaldize what had been a mid-level state university, albeit one with Research One status. ASU was re-branded “The New American University.” Soon after he arrived, Crow, who held degrees in Public Policy and Public Administration (Science and Technology Policy), called the entire faculty of the College of Education (COE) to a meeting. I remember it like it was yesterday, because I knew from that moment on that the COE’s days were numbered—especially my program, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS). The ASU program was one of the top ten graduate programs in public universities in the field. Our faculty included three Regents Professors, Mary Lee Smith, Gene V. Glass, and David Berliner, and a number of other highly accomplished policy researchers including Alex Molnar, Terrence Wiley, and Teresa McCarty. These scholars were internationally known in

educational policy research, and perhaps more importantly as public intellectuals. They were also at odds with many of the policies being promoted by the Arizona State Department of Education, especially the development of unregulated charter schools, English-only instruction, and the development of and the use of “high stakes” tests as both graduation requirements for K-12 students and as a way of evaluating teacher “merit.” As a generalization, the COE faculty saw attacks on public education as a policy of right-wing politicians, of which Arizona has no shortage.

The meeting was held in a lecture hall, faculty seated in the “student” desks and Crow standing at the podium on a raised dais. One of the more junior faculty asked president Crow what his position as a policy analyst was on some of these issues. Red faced and obviously angry, Crow came down from the dais and shouted directly at Glass and Berliner, who were seated next to each other. I am paraphrasing, but the gist was that “Policy analysts do not take positions. Their job is to collect data for the real decision makers to use in setting policy.” The faculty remained mutely embarrassed while Crow’s angry tirade went on for some time. The adversarial relationship between ASU’s COE and the conservative officials at the State Department of Education was clearly more than a sore point for Crow. Moreover, he clearly intended to do something about it.

Berliner’s book *The Manufactured Crisis* (Berliner and Biddle 1995) exposed and debunked the right-wing attack on public schools. Alex Molnar’s work excoriated the effect of business on public schools (Molnar 2001). Through The Education Policy Research Unit (EPRU), Alex and his colleagues quickly and directly attacked misinformation distributed by right-wing think tanks; Gene Glass had created one of the first online, peer-reviewed scholarly journals in education, *Education Policy Analysis Archives* (<http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/>), which freely distributed a good deal of policy analysis similarly countering attacks on public schools and disproving many of the claims by those who advocated market-based school reforms like vouchers and charter schools. Glass and Berliner had each published peer-reviewed papers showing that so-called charter schools operated to increase racial and social class segregation. And Smith was examining the Arizona school controversies as “political spectacle” (Smith, Miller-Kahn, Heinecke, and Jarvis 2004). At the time, Thomas “Tom” Horne had recently replaced Lisa Graham Keegan as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Arizona.

In 1995 Keegan had laid plans to develop a test required for students to graduate high school, and the following year the legislature established AIMS, the Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards. In 1999, the first official year of the test, nine out of ten sophomores failed the math exam.<sup>24</sup> As one of the foremost statisticians in educational research, Glass testified in court that, even if the curriculum and the examination questions were in alignment, there was no scientific basis for where to set the “cut point” for passing or failure. It was purely a political decision whether 60, 70, or 80 percent of students “passed” the exam.

Both Keegan and Horne pushed extremely conservative agendas mandating English Only instruction, advocated for school vouchers or tax refunds for parents sending their children to private (including religious) schools, and eventually banning Ethnic Studies in K-12 schools. The adversarial relationship between Educational Policy Studies at ASU and the State Department of Education was, in my opinion, a factor motivating Crow’s anger, which at the time seemed both out of control and inappropriate for his first meeting with more than 100 faculty members of one of the largest and most successful colleges of Education in the nation.

The college got a new dean and was reorganized and re-branded as “The Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education” but the 4000+ undergraduates in the Teacher Preparation Program were placed under a different dean. This was done in two back-to-back half-hour meetings called by the Provost—they took place at the exact moment of the Obama inauguration. In the Tuesday, January 20, 2009, meetings, the faculty were given the new Organization Chart, and after a brief descriptive presentation (no questions), faculty were asked to leave through the back door so staff could file in through the front door.

Mary Lou Fulton and Graduate School of Education staff were told that they would each meet with their supervisor within the next few hours and would receive an envelope. Some were told to empty their desks and go home immediately; others, with more seniority, were expected to stay at their posts through October. I cannot even write about the shock and tears of people who had just been summarily fired, almost all women, some of whom I had worked with at the university for fifteen years.

This “reorganization” essentially left the graduate programs without financial support beyond grant overhead funds. The new dean dressed very well and assured us that everything would be fine. But I noticed that the new programs had not received any of the “magic” words like “sustainability” “global” “embedded” or even “student success” (discussed below). I took this as a strong indication that the enterprise was doomed from the start. I had stopped going to faculty meetings, considering them a waste of time and a sham democratic process, but as cynical as I was, I was not prepared for a text from one of my junior colleagues who wrote from a meeting “What does ‘disestablished’ mean?” I did not have the heart to text back. The Mary Lou Fulton College of Education (MLF) was “disestablished” in May 2010 by the Arizona Board of Regents. The memo read in part: “The faculty in the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education will be reassigned to the appropriate academic unit that best fits their expertise.”<sup>25</sup> In its place a MLF “Teachers College” was established. Seemingly little or no thought had been given to approximately 400 graduate students in the “pipeline.” The new dean left abruptly in mid-term, December 2010.

I was able to move my tenure line to the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication; many older faculty, including those named above as public intellectuals, retired; some of the best and brightest moved to other, more hospitable, universities. Many faculty from Psychology in Education, especially the program in Measurement and Statistics and Methodological Studies (MSMS), went to “Family Dynamics” and a rather large group found themselves outside of any program but became affiliated with a newly branded “School of Social Transformation.” Then an even more telling set of demands took place. In a widely circulated memo from the Provost dated August 12, 2010, it was announced that

Faculty from the MLF Institute that have been reassigned to other departments continue to have teaching responsibilities in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. They cannot take on teaching assignments at this time. . . [but] will be dependent on the needs of the Mary Lou Fulton College to deliver the programs under their responsibility.

This communique solved the immediate problem of what to do with the graduate students still needing classes, committee members, and chairs. But it accomplished a far more important administrative goal of defining faculty as “employees” to be reassigned as needed or desired. In my own case, even though I was a full-time faculty member in Communication, I was required to teach “my full load” in the Teachers College. At one point, when I was teaching

Communication classes, my chair received a “bill” from the Teachers College for \$4,000 per course—I presume to cover a TA’s salary.

### *Re-branding and Weakening the Power of the Disciplines*

George Ritzer (1996) used the organization of fast food industries as exemplary of new management systems that demanded “efficiency,” “calculability,” “predictability,” and “control.” McDonaldization also included reliance on “shadow labor” (Lambert 2011). In the fast food industry this means tasks such as picking up and “fixing” your food and bussing your table. Lately it has meant “checking” yourself out at the supermarket.

In “The New American University” shadow work has meant that students go online to do everything from registering and scheduling their classes and paying their bills, to creating their “Program of Study” and even, for graduate students, scheduling the room for their oral defense. For faculty “shadow work” includes preparing an online Faculty Activity Report (FAR) for annual review, managing benefits and time and leave statements, filing grades, and so on. Shadow work eliminated many staff positions including departmental secretaries, administrative assistants, and business managers. Mass firings of administrative staff with institutional memory aided in the “culture shock” intended to break up existing social relationships.

McDonaldization accelerated already ongoing processes of replacing tenure and tenure-track faculty with adjuncts who were paid by the course and received little if any benefits. As I wrote in an earlier review of Dennis Hayes and Robin Wynyard’s anthology on the McDonaldization of Higher Education (Margolis 2004, p. 368):

Where not so long ago professors “owned” the tools of scholarship, controlled the labor process, and certified the quality of our product, the process of McDonaldization has torn this relation asunder. Rapidly increasing student faculty ratios, mass classes, and the use of low-wage teaching assistants and adjunct faculty have changed the job of professor. (Hayes and Wynyard 2002, p. 64 ff.)

One of the most visible results of the practices McDonaldization set in motion has been “re-branding.” While still Arizona State University, in almost every case it was simultaneously referred to as “The New American University” and was planned to become the largest university in the United States—which it has achieved. In fall of 2010 ASU had more than 58,000 students.<sup>26</sup> Under the slogan “One University in Many Places” (which faculty and students quickly turned into “one university all over the place”), ASU East campus was re-branded the “Polytechnic” campus. The school of art and the school of design were merged into the “Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts.” The ASU College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS), reflecting its own changes, describes itself thus:

Just as ASU is positioning itself as a model of the New American University, the college is redefining liberal arts education for the 21st century. Along with such traditional core departments as chemistry, English, physics and psychology, the college has created a number of transdisciplinary schools that facilitate the creation of new knowledge across disciplinary boundaries. Among these are the schools of Earth and Space Exploration, Human Evolution and Social Change, International Letters and Cultures, and Social and Family Dynamics.<sup>27</sup>

Within CLAS, the School of Justice Studies, which had taken 25 years to build a nationally recognized name and reputation, was rebranded as “Justice and Social Inquiry.” Most of the

ethnic studies programs and women and gender studies were downgraded and incorporated in the new “School of Social Transformation” that modestly proclaims “Together we create new knowledge that challenges conventional thinking and transforms the world.”<sup>28</sup> Meanwhile, Chicana/o Studies became ASU’s “School of Transborder Studies.” The CLAS at ASU is currently composed of the following:

- Earth and Space Exploration
- Geographical Sciences and Urban Planning
- Historical, Philosophical and Religious Studies
- Human Communication
- Human Evolution and Social Change
- International Letters and Cultures
- Life Sciences
- Mathematical and Statistical Sciences
- Politics and Global Studies
- Social and Family Dynamics
- Social Transformation
- Transborder Studies

Departments:

- Aerospace Studies
- Chemistry and Biochemistry
- English
- Military Science
- Physics
- Psychology
- Speech and Hearing Science

Programs:

- American Indian Studies
- Jewish Studies
- Naval Science<sup>29</sup>

This is not simply about name changing, which might simply be amusingly pretentious. It is about disrupting the power of academic departments and their connections to larger disciplines and professional organizations. While there are sociologists in Communication, Justice and Social Inquiry, and so on, there is no department of sociology and thus no direct connection with the American Sociological Association which might interject itself in matters of promotion and tenure or research ethics. Anthropology is in a similar situation, re-branded “the ASU School of Human Evolution & Social Change.” Similar dis-integration occurred in

other schools and colleges. The Ira A. Fulton School of Engineering restructured its departments such as Computer Science, Electrical, Mechanical, and Aerospace Engineering into five new units. Initially, the faculty were given the mandate to identify new names that included none of the original departmental terms in their titles. After a brief softening (anecdotally, at least partially resulting from funding agency confusion about the applicability of faculty from the new departments to apply for funding) a series of generic titles similar to the other “reorganizations” were developed, also with little resemblance to their professional associations and organizations:

School of Biological and Health Systems Engineering

School of Computing, Informatics, and Decision Systems Engineering

School of Electrical, Computer and Energy Engineering

School for Engineering of Matter, Transport and Energy

School of Sustainable Engineering and the Built Environment<sup>30</sup>

The importance of disciplines in the development of science cannot be overestimated. When Stephen Toulmin wrote his 1972 rejoinder to Kuhn’s *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Kuhn 1970) he argued that

what was fundamental to the development of “human understanding” was not “paradigms” subject to radical transformation in “crisis” times, but rather “disciplines”—that is, the stable institutions of the continuing scientific community which are predicated upon assumptions as to how knowledge was to be gained (e.g., physiological processes are to be explained in chemical terms). Thus, Toulmin concentrated on explaining how social institutions develop procedures for understanding, how they change those procedures, evaluate their efficacy and present the understanding gathered from them. (Toulmin 1972) (Cited in Margolis, 1976, p. 26)

The position of “The New American University” is thus antithetical and hostile to the notion that the professoriate consisted of independent intellectuals, whose work was best judged by disciplines of like-minded scholars familiar with the presuppositions and standards of truth. Instead, professors are seen as employees of the university as corporation, and the officers of that corporation should be free to hire or fire, as well as to determine their working conditions.

Multidisciplinarity, has taken place slowly over decades as the arts and sciences developed new fields—psychopharmacology, behavioral genetics, justice studies and so on—created out of new knowledge and which developed their own “courts of reason” (Toulmin 1972). However, the creation of “made-up” disciplines like “social transformation” or “Language, Literacies and Technology” have quite the opposite effect by degrading independent researchers guided by disciplinary standards into mere employees. Moreover, future graduates may have a difficult time “selling” their degrees in traditional university settings.

### *Centralizing the Tenure Process*

Another clear example of the centralizing of command and control structures took place in matters of promotion and tenure. It has always been the case that the last and deciding stage in the tenure and promotion process took place in the president’s office. Except in unusual circumstances, recommendations from the scholar’s department, college, or school, and the university tenure and promotion committee were accepted by the provost and president. But as the new president of Arizona State University, or just to show that there was a new sheriff

in town, Dr. Crow made a number of decisions overriding tradition. In some cases tenure was awarded but not promotion, in other cases promotion but not tenure—which produced the odd effect of having an untenured professor eligible for a sabbatical. Several lawsuits resulted.

### *The University as Spectacle*

Most colleges and universities have created themselves as “spectacle” whether through centuries of tradition like the Harvard-Yale football rivalry, or slightly more recent Texas A&M’s bonfires. There are well-known “school colors” and mascots. Semi-professional college sports teams are consumption offered as spectacle and recreation. Nevertheless, in re-creating itself as “The” New American University, ASU has done more to manufacture itself as spectacle than most. Much of the new spectacle consists of re-branding and commercialism. There has been much concern expressed that ASU was perceived as a “party school” and not as a serious institution, and the new words expressed attempts to counter the image.

Faculty and students alike have mocked the “Word Salad” at “The New American University” because it consists of odd slogans like “We embrace complexity” that seem like they were written by Madison Avenue—they sound pretty but are generally empty of content—something like IBM’s current advertisement about “engines of a smarter planet”<sup>31</sup>—as if there were dumb planets—or universities that embraced simplicity. On the ASU website the reader is told that “Eight design aspirations guide ASU’s transformation.” With the exception of perhaps number six, discussed earlier, this is a kind of magical thinking; either free-floating signifiers empty of content, or simply a publicist’s restatement of what every university strives for:

01. Leverage Our Place

ASU embraces its cultural, socioeconomic and, physical setting.

02. Transform Society

ASU catalyzes social change by being connected to social needs.

03. Value Entrepreneurship

ASU uses its knowledge and encourages innovation.

04. Conduct Use-Inspired Research

ASU research has purpose and impact.

05. Enable Student Success

ASU is committed to the success of each unique student.

06. Fuse Intellectual Disciplines

ASU creates knowledge by transcending academic disciplines.

07. Be Socially Embedded

ASU connects with communities through mutually beneficial partnerships.

08. Engage Globally

ASU engages with people and issues locally, nationally and internationally.<sup>32</sup>

Yet another spectacle of McDonaldisation is what is termed “Residential Life.” Freshmen are generally required to live on campus as part of the ASU “experience” and there are a variety of choices in cost, amenities, and lifestyle. (It is also the case that while tuition for all three Arizona Universities is set by the Board of Regents, fees including dorm rents, meal tickets, and so on are not.)

Living on campus gives you access to a new world of opportunities in a dynamic university environment. The residential experience is designed to promote your academic and personal success and to help you make the most of your first year as a Sun Devil. Student housing at the Tempe campus is divided into neighborhoods, each offering its residents a variety of academic support services, study lounges and wireless connectivity, co-curricular programming and dining options.<sup>33</sup>

There are also “residential colleges” for example the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College: “All first-time incoming freshman education majors are required to live in the Residential College unless they are exempt by University Housing.” As part of the residential college experience one is promised dinner with the dean, ice cream socials, tutoring, peer mentoring etc.<sup>34</sup> It simultaneously creates a panoptical world in which the student is endlessly observed and must engage in impression management (Goffman [1959] 1971, pp. 203ff) and emotional labor (Hochschild 1983).

As another example of Ritzer’s notion of “implosion” as a hallmark of McDonaldization in higher education, just this month (November 2011) another block of older student housing was bulldozed to make way for what is being described as “Tempe’s most exclusive student housing community. . . . huge apartments and townhouses, leather-style sectional sofa, hardwood-style flooring, etc.” The complex will include a fitness center, computer center and a “resort-style” pool.<sup>35</sup> While the term “exclusive” is unfortunate and suggests the publicist never learned American history,<sup>36</sup> this is intended for older and/or married students. If the new housing follows the pattern, the ground floor will be rented as retail space. Thus the dorm and the resort hotel have merged.

## Conclusion

Actually there is no way to conclude or adequately summarize what is an ongoing process. McDonaldization has proceeded faster and more completely in England because, as many of the chapters in the *McDonaldization of Higher Education* indicate, their system is much more centralized than higher education in the U.S. (Hayes and Wynyard 2002).

Nevertheless, the process is bound to accelerate here due to a combination of forces including the ongoing economic crisis that is leading many states to reduce funding for state colleges and universities; competition with private for-profit universities specializing in “have it your way” schedules, simulation, and the manipulation of time and space through computerized instruction; increasing tuition and other costs of living that reinforce the student as consumer-of-a-service view; and the demand for “edutainment.”

Will “The New American University” become a model? Perhaps. But there is an internal contradiction in the “re-branding” which, as with all products, is intended to set ASU apart from similar products. It must remain unique and have a reasonable cost if it is to meet its 100,000 student goal. Moreover, it is unlikely that neologisms like the school of “social transformation” will catch on and may not even have much shelf life here. There have been several other units here that were given spectacular names, had a few years in the sun, and then quietly disappeared.

Given the diffuse nature of higher education in the U.S., and its already strong hierarchical structure, the McDonaldized University will likely occupy the same kind of niche as the food franchise. The Ivy Leagues and similar “highly selective” universities (Stanford, the “Seven

Sisters”. . .) will remain at the top. High quality and selective state universities—Wisconsin—Madison, Berkeley, Michigan—Ann Arbor—may adopt some elements of McDonaldization but have little reason to re-brand themselves. Small high quality liberal arts colleges like the so-called “little three” in New England, the Claremont colleges, Bard and so on already offer real individual instruction and mentoring and have no need for the simulacrum created through McDonaldization.

Many of the old elements of the hidden curricula have quietly returned. Ties with the military, especially in Research One universities, are if anything much stronger than they were in the 1960s. There are top-secret facilities at ASU like the former “Air Force Research Lab” near the polytechnic campus where public/private partnerships are planned.<sup>37</sup> There is also a semi-public Army/ASU project to create flexible screens for battlefield use.<sup>38</sup> It is not unrelated that Criminal Justice is one of the fastest growing fields and where job opportunities are available; and ASU offers majors ranging from the BS to the Ph.D.<sup>39</sup> Also many of the research grants solicited focus on developing new technologies for Homeland Security.<sup>40</sup>

Although the old gender-segregated dorms will not return, “choice” has allowed some elements to be re-instated. In one of ASU’s dormitory neighborhoods, the building is co-educational—but the fourth floor is for women only. All buildings on campus are non-smoking and alcohol can only be served in the University Club. Nevertheless, binge drinking is a major problem, and there have been alcohol-related student deaths.

Fear of terrorism and school shootings have replaced fear of atomic attack. In place of duck and cover drills, ASU has basically developed a militarized police force that patrols the campus on every type of vehicle from foot patrols to Segways. When we arrived in 1995, the police “headquarters” was a modular building and the campus police were unarmed. Today they carry hand guns and what I presume is pepper spray. All three Arizona universities have armed police with assault rifles.<sup>41</sup> There have been several bills in the legislature to allow faculty and students to carry concealed weapons on campus but, although the last one passed, the governor vetoed it. The new campus police headquarters is a large building defined by a bar-like façade, and they have 141 personnel, many of whom no doubt spend hours monitoring surveillance cameras.<sup>42</sup> Security video cameras are all over campus; surveillance is the new *in loco parentis*, I suppose. Regardless of how one feels about the direction taken by this evolution of higher education, it would be an interesting exercise to assess the effectiveness of the “The New American University” and what alternatives might be possible in fulfilling the significant educational mandate given by Arizona’s founders. Section six of Article 11 of the Arizona Constitution outlines this charge (italics added for emphasis):

Text of Section 6:

Admission of students of both sexes to state educational institutions; tuition; common school system.

*The university and all other state educational institutions shall be open to students of both sexes, and the instruction furnished shall be as nearly free as possible.* The legislature shall provide for a system of common schools by which a free school shall be established and maintained in every school district for at least six months in each year, which school shall be open to all pupils between the ages of six and twenty-one years.<sup>43</sup>

## Notes

1. Cf. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nelson\\_A.\\_Rockefeller#Education](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nelson_A._Rockefeller#Education)
2. There were of course exceptions like the City University of New York, Hunter College and The University of Chicago that had helped many immigrant children get higher educations. But nothing like the massive expansion of public universities that began with the GI Bill.
3. There is no doubt that the strong form was dominant in the 60s and early 70s. Even in the state universities there were few students of color. The gendering process visible in dorm life continued as women were tracked into traditional occupations—teaching and nursing for example (at New Paltz art education was a popular choice). Everyone knew that in general “state universities” were for the middle classes and upwardly mobile as opposed to the Ivy Leagues, the Seven Sisters or Stanford.
4. Taken from the online version at [http://bau2.uibk.ac.at/sg/poe/works/p\\_letter.html](http://bau2.uibk.ac.at/sg/poe/works/p_letter.html)
5. The full text is available online: <http://www2.fiu.edu/~yaf/sharon.html>
6. Full text at <http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/huron.html>
7. Ibid.
8. A video of the speech is online at [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5o\\_0ZYA5HM](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5o_0ZYA5HM)
9. The text of Eisenhower’s Farewell address can be read here: <http://www.h-net.org/~hst306/documents/indust.html>, and seen on BBC TV here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nUXtyIQjubU>
10. Clark Kerr’s influential 1963 book detailed the successes and troubling influences of the emerging “multiversity” that included undergraduate and graduate teaching, professional schools like medicine and law, as well as being the most important center for research and development. Cf. Kerr, Clark. [1963] 2001. *The Uses of the University: The Godkin Lectures on the Essentials of Free Government and the Duties of the Citizen*. Reprint, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. A decade later, Talcott Parsons & Platt’s *The American University* explained how the structure of the university, with its disparate functions including undergraduate and graduate education, professional schools like law and medicine, and research grew and were indispensable. Parsons, Talcott, and Gerald M. Platt. 1973. *The American University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
11. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General\\_education\\_requirements](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_education_requirements)
12. “The term “affirmative action” was first used in the United States. It first appeared in Executive Order 10925, which was signed by President John F. Kennedy on March 6, 1961, and it was used to refer to measures to achieve non-discrimination. In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson issued Executive Order 11246, which required federal contractors to take “affirmative action” to hire without regard to race, religion and national origin. In 1968, gender was added to the anti-discrimination list. . . . In 2003, a Supreme Court decision concerning affirmative action in universities allowed educational institutions to consider race as a factor in admitting students, but ruled that strict point systems are unconstitutional.” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Affirmative\\_action](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Affirmative_action)
13. See chapters in Margolis, Eric. 2001. *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.
14. <http://sts.asu.edu/>
15. *BBC News World Edition*, “Millions join global anti-war protests,” February 17, 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2765215.stm> (retrieved November 12, 2011); *Frontline*, “Operation Iraqi Freedom: A chronology of the six-week invasion of Iraq, drawn from the FRONTLINE documentary” PBS, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/invasion/cron/> (retrieved November 25, 2011)
16. <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2011/03/harvard-welcomes-back-rotc/>
17. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Church\\_Committee](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Church_Committee). See also full report: Church, Frank, John G. Tower, et al. 1975. *Covert Action in Chile 1963–1973*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office 63–372.
18. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human\\_Terrain\\_System](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_Terrain_System)
19. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal\\_Family\\_Education\\_Loan\\_Program](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_Family_Education_Loan_Program); [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal\\_Direct\\_Student\\_Loan\\_Program](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_Direct_Student_Loan_Program)
20. <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2011/08/chart-of-the-day-student-loans-have-grown-511-since-1999/243821/>
21. <http://www.forbes.com/2010/08/01/student-loan-financial-aid-opinions-colleges-10-debt.html>
22. Grade inflation was also boosted by formal student course evaluations and informal online “rate your professor” sites.
23. A list of Dr. Crow’s relations with elements of the U.S. government can be found in his biography on *Wikipedia*. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\\_M.\\_Crow](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_M._Crow)
24. <http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/0516aimslawsuit0516.html>
25. <https://provost.asu.edu/files/shared/capc/April%20202010/UAC%20and%20CAPC%20Acad%20Re-org.pdf>
26. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_United\\_States\\_university\\_campuses\\_by\\_enrollment](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_United_States_university_campuses_by_enrollment)
27. <http://clas.asu.edu/about>

28. It is interesting that after “Justice Studies” formed itself when a group of sociologists left Sociology, it took decades to have the name—hence the legitimacy of the degree—recognized. Many of these new brands will have the same problem placing graduate students from programs that, no matter how novel and transdisciplinary, have no established meaning in academia; <http://sst.clas.asu.edu>
29. <http://clas.asu.edu/academicunits>
30. <http://engineering.asu.edu/schools/>
31. <https://www.ibm.com/engines>
32. <http://newamericanuniversity.asu.edu/design-aspirations/>
33. <http://www.asu.edu/housing/>
34. <http://education.asu.edu/content/residential-colleges>
35. <http://vistadelosol.com/>
36. “Exclusive” in American history meant no Blacks, no Jews, and no Mexicans allowed—depending on what part of the country in which the exclusive housing or country club was located.
37. <http://www.azcentral.com/community/mesa/articles/2010/11/21/20101121asu-mesa-gateway-research-lab.html>
38. <http://www.asu.edu/feature/includes/spring05/readmore/flexdisplay.html>
39. <http://ccj.asu.edu/degree-programs>
40. [http://asunews.asu.edu/20080228\\_homelandsecurity](http://asunews.asu.edu/20080228_homelandsecurity)
41. <http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/local/articles/0305asuguns0305.html>
42. <http://cfo.asu.edu/police>
43. [http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Article\\_11%2C\\_Arizona\\_Constitution](http://ballotpedia.org/wiki/index.php/Article_11%2C_Arizona_Constitution)

## References

- Apple, M. W., and Nancy R. King. 1977. What Do Schools Teach? *Curriculum Inquiry* 6: 341–358.
- Berliner, David, and Bruce J. Biddle. 1995. *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America's Public Schools*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Bloom, Allan. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Goffman, Erving. [1959] 1971. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Reprint, London: Penguin Books.
- Hayes, Dennis, and Robin Wynyard. 2002. *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hochschild, Arlie. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Klatch, Rebecca E. 1999. *A Generation Divided: The new left, the right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lambert, Craig. 2011. Our Unpaid, Extra Shadow Work. *New York Times*, October 29.
- Margolis, Eric. 1976. Paradigms, Disciplines and Human Understanding. In *Forms and Formulations of Education*, ed. E. Rose, 16–44. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2001. *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2004. Review of *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, edited by Dennis Hayes and Robin Wynyard. *The Journal of Higher Education* 75: 368–370.
- Margolis, Eric, Michael Soldatenko, Sandra Acker, and Marina Gair. 2001. Peekaboo: Hiding and Outing the Curriculum. In *The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education*, ed. E. Margolis, 1–19. New York: Routledge.
- Molnar, Alex. 2001. *Giving Kids the Business: The Commercialization of America's Schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Parsons, Talcott, and Gerald M. Platt. 1973. *The American University*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pritchett, Price, and Ron Pound. 1993. High-Velocity Culture Change: A Handbook for Managers.” Dallas, Texas: Pritchett & Associates.
- Ritzer, George. 2002. Enchanting McUniversity: Toward a Spectacularly Irrational University Quotidian. In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, ed. D. Hayes and R. Wynyard, 19–32. Westport CT.: Bergin & Garvey.
- Ritzer, George. 1996. *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rodriguez, Richard. [1982] 1983. *Hunger for Memory: The Education of Richard Rodriguez*. Toronto: Bantam Books.
- Smith, Mary Lee, Linda Miller-Kahn, Walter Heinecke, and Patricia Jarvis. 2004. *Political spectacle and the fate of of American schools*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Soldatenko, Michael. 1998. The Origins of Academic Chicano Studies 1967–1970: The Emergence of Empirical and Perspectivist Chicano Studies. *Latino Studies Journal* 9 (2): 3–25.

- . 1999. Empirical Chicano Studies: The Formation of Academic Chicano Studies, 1970–1975. *Latino Studies Journal* 10 (3): 67–96.
- Steal, Shelby. 1991. *The Content of Our Character: A New Vision of Race in America*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Sykes, Charles J. 1988. *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education*. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway.
- Toulmin, Stephen. 1972. *Human Understanding: The Collective Use and Evolution of Concepts*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.