

Introduction

The Management of the Academic Profession

Over the course of the past several decades, universities and colleges in the United States have adopted neoliberal practices that are manifest in the management of the academic profession, in the actions of both academic managers and faculty. Yet, simultaneously with these neoliberal practices, the academic traditions and practices of universities and colleges continue and the values that underpin these traditions and practices are robust. The context of academic management—the contemporary U.S. public university and its qualities and characteristics—forms the organizational social structure for roles, behaviors, and identities of the actors: the faculty, or academics, and academic administrators. We argue that university values, and what we refer to as academic logic, are to a large extent antithetical to neoliberalism and managerialism; that is, the influence of managers whereby organizational management is the primary system of authority within a university is incompatible with the traditions of faculty autonomy and faculty governance. Yet, in this apparently incompatible condition, academics—both faculty and managers—are able to function in, and rationalize, their roles and maintain an academic professional identity. This professional identity of academics and academic managers is both verified and countermanded by the context of the university and the practices of academic management. As a result, academics construct understandings of themselves as both resisters of and contributors to neoliberalism, as well as victims and promoters, including what is termed managerialism (Gumport, 2000). That is, academics both participate in and counteract neoliberal and managerial practices. To advance our argument, we offer a critical review of the scholarly literature with attention to neoliberalism in the university and academic logic.

We draw in large part on the scholarship of non-U.S. countries (e.g., Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Netherlands, and the UK), and include U.S. scholarship that can help us make our explanations both lucid and valid. Our specific focus is the U.S. university, but international scholarship and examples help us clarify our arguments. For example, we note that while U.S. scholarship speaks to alterations in the academic profession, which are sometimes the consequence of revenue-generating behaviors, sometimes the consequence of the rise of a managerial class in the university, and sometimes the result of prestige-seeking behaviors, unlike in the UK, U.S. scholarship is not focused upon the “isms” of social behaviors (e.g., neoliberalism, managerialism) or the effects of managerial practices upon individual academics. U.S. scholarship concerns itself with outcomes relevant to the academic profession (e.g., diminution of a faculty role in governance, percentages and consequences of a part-time workforce), and addresses general faculty (community college, four-year college, university) as a whole (e.g., workload pressures). Rarely does this U.S. body of scholarship examine underlying conditions or ideologies, such as new managerialism (Deem & Brehony, 2005). Here, we try to correct this omission. We conclude this Introduction with an elucidation of our position on this dynamic: The U.S. university is neither an idealized community of scholars organized as an academic bureaucracy nor solely a neoliberal, corporate, or enterprise institution. Universities are sites where multiple logics (neoliberal logic and academic logic) coexist, alter each other, and blend with one another. In this context, members of the academic profession (faculty and academic managers) have adopted managerial behaviors, and academic management in the U.S. university combines both traditional values of the university, such as academic freedom, peer review and evaluation, and the pursuit of knowledge, and values of the economic marketplace, such as efficiency, resource and financial acquisition, and personal or private benefits. In subsequent chapters, we develop this argument and focus upon tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, department chairs, and deans.

Academics and Authority in the University

Few recent scholarly pieces address the source or locus of university management, and those that do address university management depict it as ambiguous and contradictory. David Labaree (2017) relies upon Weber’s three categories of organizational authority: traditional, rational, and charismatic.

He sidesteps or excludes Slaughter and Rhoades' (2004) academic capitalist knowledge regime, Marginson and Considine's (2000) liberal market authority, and Ward's (2012) neoliberalism. Labaree argues that all three of Weber's types are present in the contemporary U.S. university. Traditional authority is associated with what we refer to as academic institutional logic, although Labaree stresses the guild-like characteristics of university academics. There is, however, no specific inclusion of department chairs, associate deans, deans, and provosts into this guild, nor is there a differentiation between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. This guild-like structure, for Labaree, provides faculty with considerable authority in the university. The lack of categorization of faculty (e.g., academic professional and managerial professionals and tenure track and non-tenure track) obfuscates the claim of traditional authority in the hands of faculty.

The rational system of authority, while not specific or clarified in Labaree's discussion, is likely a rational bureaucracy or a bureaucratic organization configuration consistent with Mintzberg's (1983,1989) organizational power configuration. Yet, this rational bureaucracy is not the same as Mintzberg's professional bureaucracy (1991). Labaree equates this system with hierarchical positional authority, absent ideology or values or subjectivity but rather focused upon efficiency. This system is what associates the university with a bureaucratic organization such as a government department or a corporation (minus the focus upon profit).

Charismatic authority for Labaree rests with faculty, particularly prestigious faculty: renowned scholars, revenue generators, and endowed chairs. Although this categorization of authority in the university has appeal, it is not supported in the scholarly literature. Indeed, for scholars such as Finkelstein, Martin Conley, and Schuster (2016), the profile and position of faculty in the university have deteriorated since the 1980s, and their role in governance and decision making, whether as a group or as individuals, is limited. Certainly, their authority as individuals is negligible or nonexistent. A case could be made that individual faculty have authority over curriculum and instruction but that is debatable given university policies that prescribe rules and regulations. For major university functions (e.g., budget and finance, community relations, facilities), individual faculty have, at best, advisory roles (e.g., through a senate). Indeed, for Birnbaum (1989), faculty authority is symbolic, neither legal nor enacted in practice.

Unlike Readings (1997) who despairs over the state of the U.S. university and Ward (2012) and others who castigate the institution for its acceptance of liberal market values, Labaree praises the U.S. university's

embrace of the market, its ambiguous, and sometimes contradictory, purposes and goals, and its multiple authority systems. Similar to Readings and Ward, and others, Labaree wants a summative statement or concept to serve as a truth for the U.S. university. For Labaree, it is a “fine mess,” a work of achievement and accomplishment even though it suggests March and Cohen’s (1974) “organized anarchy.”

Our view differs from these and other scholars in that definitive statements about the university and particularly about the academic profession might provide a conceptualization of the characteristics of an entity but do not explain how or the way in which the entity behaves and acts. Our view is that behaviors and actions are consequences of management within an organization, and we align our views with Mintzberg’s on power (Mintzberg, 1983). Both internal and external systems of influence shape the exercise of power, carried out in the university largely by administrators, faculty, staff, and, indeed, students. The management of the academic profession is enacted by academic professionals or faculty and academic managers. The academic logic, or systems of ideology and expertise (Mintzberg, 1983), that influences the behaviors of faculty also affects the behaviors of managers, although faculty and academic managers are dependent upon and follow in their actions systems of authority. When these systems break down or prove to be inadequate, then a system of politics may take over (Mintzberg, 1983).

Traditionally for universities, particularly in the latter half of the twentieth century, a dominant view, belief, or assumption held among faculty and administrators, and this view persists to the present in the form as an expectation or norm, is that management is collegial, with the underlying view that academics are responsible professionals and that academic managers rely upon faculty for academic decisions (Haviland, Alleman, & Allen, 2017). Faculty, it is assumed, do not have to be accountable, at least to administrators, for their professional activities and their duties of teaching, research, and service. Management in the non-collegial sense plays a more important role for activities that are not in the center of the academic profession, such as budgets, human resources, facilities, and marketing and publicity. In those cases, nonacademic managers have responsibilities and authority to act. In the academic domain, it is department chairs and deans, as academic managers among a larger group of administrators, who are expected to manage academic matters and ensure that others are doing their part. In service that is more aligned with the academic function of the university, committee chairs, who are likely faculty, are expected to manage the business of the committee, and assumed, because they are faculty, to

perform in a collegial manner. If management then can be collegial, the term *collegial management* (Tight, 2014) carries with it the assumed identity of professionals, and includes both faculty and academic managers. When administrators do not perform to the expectations of faculty and fail to consult with or depend upon faculty for decisions, then they are charged with lacking in collegiality. This notion goes back in the literature to John Corson (1960) and Paul Goodman (1962), is reiterated much later by Robert Birnbaum (1988), and reinforced into the twenty-first century (Finkelstein et al., 2016; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). The legacy of collegiality, shared governance, the community of scholars, and even collegial management (often equated with academic values, or what we term academic logic) persists.

In some contrast to this persistent view, the pervasive encroachment of neoliberalism and its ethos have resulted in the remaking of C. P. Snow's (1961) *Two Cultures*, from a Traditional culture, or culture of Humanities, and a Scientific culture to two new worlds in the contemporary university. One is a culture of nostalgia (Ylijoki, 2005), aligned with an academic logic and a practice of collegiality, and associated with a professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1991); the other is a culture of competition (Ball, 2012; Ward, 2012), aligned with neoliberal logic, including values of efficiency, surveillance, and productivity. The presence of neoliberal logic in the university is viewed as detrimental to academic logic by numerous scholars, both in the United States and internationally (Archer, 2008; Ball, 2012a, 2012b; Clegg, 2008; Davies, 2005; Giroux, 2014; Gonzalez, Martinez, & Ordu, 2013; Gould, 2003; Ozga, 1998; Ward, 2012). Martin Finkelstein, Ming Ju, and William Cummings (2011) report that during the period of 1992–2007, faculty influence at research universities diminished in areas of governance and management of their institutions. This diminution, they conclude, corresponds to the rise of middle managers (this includes deans and department chairs) in governance, especially in budget decision areas. Moreover, they add, this research university phenomenon is evident, although to a lesser extent, at all other higher education institutional types.

The claim from one quarter is thus of growing managerialism in U.S. universities and colleges (Levin, 2017). That is, that the influence of managers, including their policies, goals, and objectives for universities and colleges, has become the ascendant system of authority. When these managers' actions are aligned with neoliberal policies, or policies associated with economic market ideology (Collini, 2013), management of universities and colleges takes on a corporate, business-like approach that values economic goals, including efficiency and measurable outcomes of work, which

are managed. As a result, what is understood as surveillance in critiques of neoliberalism, or the monitoring of behaviors, becomes institutionalized in universities and colleges. Thus, the university possesses, and in some cases is, an “audit culture” (Levin, 2017; Shore, 2008). This condition as well is claimed to undermine U.S. universities (Ward, 2012). According to the critics of an audit culture in U.S. universities, these institutions have become businesses and corporations (Gould, 2003) driven by a managerial class (Gumpert, 2000) or regime (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) and have lost their traditional, primary role as disseminators and creators of knowledge (Readings, 1997).

Yet, there is little empirical evidence, from research investigations, aside from the perceptions of U.S. faculty in the Finkelstein et al. (2011) study, to support the claims of growing or advancing managerialism in the U.S. university. Indeed, in the United States, there is little literature compared to the UK (and other nations such as Australia, Canada, and New Zealand) that points to changes in faculty’s role in management and governance. In UK literature, a new cadre of academic managers is targeted as the responsible party that has unseated faculty from institutional governance and management (Locke & Bennion, 2011; Whitchurch, 2006). As Locke and Bennion point out, the literature of the 1990s and early 2000s on the UK’s academic profession and their place in institutional governance and management has “a thesis of loss, alienation, and retreat” (2011, p. 194). More specifically, “academics have been proletarianized, their work industrialized, their autonomy eroded, and themselves have been de-skilled. The result . . . is that the profession is demoralized and disaffected, and disengaged” (p. 194). Although Finkelstein et al. (2011) concur that U.S. faculty have increased their disaffection and disengagement, U.S. scholarship has yet to go as far as Locke and Bennion (2011) or other European scholars (Lorenz, 2012) to suggest a hollowed-out profession of academics.

Nonetheless, even though managerialism has not become a negative discourse in the United States, the signs are present to indicate that academic professionals face a daunting task if they are to maintain their professional influence upon institutions of higher education. Furthermore, as noted in at least one recent empirically based U.S. publication (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015), the professional identity of academics in the United States is threatened by neoliberal practices and initiatives. Whereas such initiatives in the UK and other democracies, such as Australia, Canada, the Netherlands, and New Zealand, emanate from governments (Lorenz, 2012; Shore, 2008), in the United States there are no similar statist interventions, for example, where

a government department would monitor research output of faculty, as in the UK. Instead, in the United States the institutional leaders—presidents, chancellors, provosts, deans, and department heads or chairs—may be the carriers of neoliberal values, which are reproduced in the actions of faculty. Thus, in the United States, these managers, particularly those who manage academics, may hold the key to the perpetuation of an academic logic in their university.

The University as a Problematical Place

The infusion of neoliberal values and practices into the U.S. university (and universities worldwide) has, unquestionably, if not altered the functioning of the academy then provided a number of tensions within individual university organizations. The university, for our purposes, is the setting in which the behaviors and actions of academics and managers play out. The traditional and long-held assumption is that the university is a sovereign place that possesses legitimacy and authority as an institution, and is free to act, within legal and legislated limits, in order to fulfill its mission, goals, and aspirations. Indeed, the notion of academic freedom is tied to this sovereignty. But sovereignty is not an empirical fact; rather, it is manifest through artifacts, texts, and actions, including rituals and individual behaviors (Davies, 2014b). In the university, sovereignty can be seen in the actions of an academic senate, in the interactions between faculty and students in a classroom, and in the written texts or oral articulations of administrators, such as deans and department chairs when they inform their faculty of a decision, a project underway, or a policy. Central to this sovereignty is trust: on the one hand, the participants trust each other that what they say and do is in good faith, carried out or conveyed with integrity, and legitimate; and, on the other hand, that there is trust among the participants for the organization (Tierney, 2008).

The individual relationship two parties build with one another differs from the relationships individuals have with their organization. At the same time, individuals create relationships with one another in an organization, and individuals develop attitudes towards the organization based on the myriad of personal relationships that occur in that context over time. (Tierney, 2008, p. 29)

Organizational trust enables individuals to trust one another, in part because individuals can be assured that their organization has integrity and legitimacy, can act to fulfill its goals, and can establish and enforce order (Davies, 2014b).

Because neoliberalism, including its multivariate and not always compatible or consistent values (e.g., state intervention and free market), and its projects rely upon institutions to alter the social and political foundations upon which liberal democratic institutions sit (Ball, 2012a, 2012b; Bourdieu, 1998; Shore, 2008; Ward, 2012), organizations are hard pressed to maintain their sovereignty. Critics of neoliberalism claim that sovereignty and trust have been replaced by surveillance (Lorenz, 2012) and an audit culture (Shore, 2008). It is the economic-rational foundation that measures the quantitative outputs of organizations, such as universities, that neoliberalism favors and seeks to institutionalize in organizations. Performance of the organization and its members, measured and tracked by both organizational agents and by the state (including state and federal governments, corporations, financiers, and other powerful groups and individuals), becomes the key and central marker of the organization's worth (Ball, 2012b; Shore, 2008).

In that part of this economic-rational foundation is tied inextricably to performance, or what Ball (2012b) and others have referred to as "performativity," competition has become, not only in the economic marketplace but also in universities, the central behavior that results in the production or actualization of value. In the university, faculty compete for grants as well as quantity in publications; both faculty and their organizations compete with other faculty and organizations for prestige; and, of course, universities compete with others for students as well as for faculty to hire. Thus, as Davies (2014b) notes, competition leads to unequal results: quantitative differences of outcomes are the goal so that what is assumed to be merit or talent or quality will prevail. Survival of the fittest, Hobbes's state of nature, where everyone is against all, and Social Darwinism apply to the competitive organization where measurable outcomes are standard ways to legitimize worth of either the organization or the individuals within it. Trust in this context, therefore, between individuals is simply an act of the establishment of allies, and trust for the organization is contingent upon the organization's ability to support and advance individual ambitions. Within this condition, the audit culture has replaced the academic culture of the university in various nations (Shore, 2008), including the U.S. (Ward, 2012). The view that a corrosive managerialism has and continues to undermine academic culture in the United States is held by a select number of U.S. scholars, from Readings (1997) to Ward (2012), and is embedded in critiques of the

neoliberal university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000), the corporate university (Gould, 2003), and the striving university (Gonzales et al., 2013).

But, the critique of neoliberalism (Giroux, 2014) not only targets the university, it extends to both academics and academic managers. The principal focus is upon managerialism or new managerialism (Deem & Brehony, 2005; Lorenz, 2012), or a regime and ideology that not only value economic rationality but also conceive of a managerial class as the dominant decision makers and operatives within a university (Gaffikin & Perry, 2009). Neoliberal ideology conjoined with new managerialism has affected universities, including the work of faculty and the dynamics of the organization, in fundamental ways. Generally, in the scholarly literature there are several dual views related to the influences of neoliberalism and managerialism. Those views directed at administrators conceive of this population as controlling of others, agents of a corporation that rewards and punishes (and monitors, surveils, and evaluates) employees, and promotes and reinforces not only an ideology of corporatism but also intolerance for difference in and resistance to dominant organizational thinking (Ward, 2012). The corporation demands compliance. It seeks to maximize outcomes toward two goals: revenues and prestige. Thus, economic rationality is preeminent as it leads to financial gain and competitiveness. Indeed, a fundamental activity in the managerial university is competition: university against university; unit against unit; and, employees against employees (Davies, 2005). Ultimately, this competition becomes individual self against individual self: “Am I improving? Am I doing enough? Where do I need to work harder?” This form of self-management or surveillance of the self is a goal of the neoliberal state (Ball, 2012a). For the individual academic professional, the result is a high level of insecurity as these professionals are unable to meet the expectations of the organization, or their peers’ expectations, or their own expectations (Davies, 2005; Gill, 2009; Gonzales et al., 2013; Knights & Clarke, 2014).

In order to cope with insecurity, individual professionals act (1) to meet some expectations, such as work productivity and thus underperform with other expectations, such as family and personal life, or (2) reject expectations and lose rewards, or (3) meet some expectations and reject others, or (4) play act with expectations and take on the appearance of meeting them but reject them in action (Knights & Clarke, 2014; Levin 2018b). Yet, whatever the actions, these cannot satisfy expectations for the self or reduce anxiety because, even in rejection of expectations, the individual lacks security.

In most cases, at least evident in research and scholarship in the UK, the Netherlands, and Australia, academics do comply with managerial expectations

(Alvesson & Spicer, 2016; Lorenz, 2012), and, as a result, academic autonomy erodes. For academics who undertake managerial work as managers, such as associate and assistant deans, department chairs, and project or unit heads—and even deans who claim a role as researchers/academics because they continue to conduct research—they serve as the organizational voice of academics and pressure other academics to conform to official university decisions. These academic managers maintain their academic legitimacy and have formal authority as managers. Overall, managerialism co-opts academic professionalism by reducing professional autonomy and authority (Winter, 2009). For some scholars (Davies, 2005), autonomy, a hallmark of a profession (Brint, 1994; Freidson, 2001), is an illusion.

Along these lines, the research university has developed into a neoliberal, managerial, corporate university while simultaneously maintaining critical characteristics of the traditional university, with an academic logic grounded in academic values. Foremost among these is collegiality (Tight, 2014), a seminal concept applicable to academic professionalism that contains several assumptions: a management structure with elected leaders; peer review of work, including testing of knowledge; and critical dialogue among academics (Sahlin, 2012, in Tight, 2014). But, as managerialism advances, scholars argue, collegiality diminishes. Trust, too, is a component of collegiality for some scholars, and trust includes respect for the expertise of other academic professionals (Tierney, 2006, 2008).

Yet, the twin logics of the university as a corporate entity and the university as a collegial organization sit together uneasily. Managerialism undermines collegiality through its focus upon measurable efficiency and productivity-centered behaviors; it rewards entrepreneurial research that is transferrable and applied but not necessarily for knowledge advancement; and, it emphasizes goals that are labor market-oriented, revenue-generating, or prestige-yielding but not sociocultural (Ozga, 1998; Tight, 2014). For some scholars, neoliberal regimes distort academic work. Davies (2005) argues that academic work is no longer the life of the intellect and imagination, and that neoliberal discourse has colonized academics. Goals of academics are shaped and determined by practices of a neoliberal state, which become institutionalized within universities (Ball, 2012a, 2012b). Neoliberal discourse infiltrates the daily work of faculty, and neoliberal values become accepted by professionals (Davies, 2005). Thus, academics become neoliberal subjects: The self is defined through economic worth (e.g., income, revenue generation); it is both vulnerable and competitive (Scharff, 2015); and, it is detached from meaningful, personal values: That is, emotional inner life is

unanchored (Davies, 2005), a view consistent with Richard Sennett's (2006) conception of the state of occupations in new capitalism. Trust is no longer relevant, and surveillance of self and others is the norm. The autonomous self is an illusion in that universities manufacture conditions of turbulence and dynamic states or contexts, which demand responses that are framed as necessary reconceptualizations and reorganizations of both institutions and daily life (Davies, 2005; Kok, Douglas, McClelland, & Bryde, 2010).

The insecurity and fragility of academic identities (Knights & Clark, 2014) are brought about and increased by controls and performance demands in the face of an idealized profession where demands exceed capacity for individuals to meet those demands. To reduce anxieties, academics will conform to managerial demands, but, in conforming, academics face a threat to the meaning of their profession. Thus, academics become colluded selves (Ozga, 1998) as they surrender to the corporation and are victims of their academic professional identity, an identity that drives their aspirations for an esteemed and valued career.

This grim and almost inescapable plight for academic professionals in the contemporary university (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016; Davies, 2005; Knights & Clarke, 2014; Koh et al., 2010; Lethabo King, 2015; Martinez Alemán, 2014; Ozga, 1998; Winter, 2009; Ylijoki, 2005) offers few if any self-critiques or alternatives. Tight (2014) ponders over, but not convincingly, whether collegiality—the essence of the academic profession—is or is not compatible with managerialism. Mountz et al. (2015) offer an alternative through collective action to adopt “slow scholarship” as an act of resistance to a metrically oriented university. As time is one of the major variables of academic capitalist and managerial regimes (Walker, 2009), control over time may provide one avenue of relief for academics. Yet, this slowing down may also lead not to reduction in overall professional work but to the production part of research. Thus, academics through slow scholarship cannot control all of the demands of and expectations for their work. Ylijoki (2005), from an alternate perspective on the preservation of academic professional identity, discovers that nostalgia is pervasive among Finland university faculty and that this nostalgia for a former academic professional identity is a coping mechanism that manifests underlying tensions between the present and the idealized past. Nostalgia, thus, points to core values that continue to exist in the present, such as academic freedom and personal autonomy. While some scholars may view nostalgia as conformity to and acceptance of present conditions, others view nostalgia as resistance both to colonization and to normalization and standardization of changes in the academy (Ylijoki, 2005).

Among the discussions of the presence of managerialism, new managerialism, and neoliberal values and projects in U.S. universities, there is no reference that suggests these are benign or beneficent conditions in the university. Nor is there an implication that new managerialism has any value to the purposes of the university in traditional understandings of the university as a knowledge creator or disseminator. Yet, in spite of the pervasiveness of neoliberal values and practices, the presence and acceptability of academic capitalism, and the control exercised by managerial regimes, academics continue to express devotion to, or idealized love for, their academic work (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016). At the same time, academics express suspicion of academic work and disdain for the control system that guides and assesses their work (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016).

In new managerialism recognized in the UK (Deem, 1998), a goal for organizational leaders and elites is to reduce identity plurality and manage outlier identities; thus, a unitary perception of organizational life—conveyed through organizational narratives—becomes or is in the process of becoming the dominant, taken-for-granted understanding. We see this in a recent UK project that addresses faculty identity alteration within a context of university sectoral change (see Appendix) (Levin, 2018a). One social scientist faculty member at a predominantly teaching university referred to organizational structures.

I think there's structures that help nurture those feelings (competitive pressures). . . . [W]e're all vulnerable, and we're all susceptible to unpleasant feelings and envy and jealousy and the whole repertoire of human emotions. But, I think when we live under very repressive and oppressive structures, we prioritize things like the flow of capital over wellbeing and health and humanity and being a human being. And then, I think that creates very, very toxic working conditions, particularly in organizations like higher education. (senior lecturer, social sciences, teaching university)

Another faculty member in Education referred to managers who have lost focus upon the educational and research function of the university, and, more importantly, on human feelings.

The problem is where they [managers] have taken on so much that they . . . have lost sight. No, I mean actually if you take on the neoliberal agenda to such an extent that you actually lose

sight that you're dealing with people as others, individuals, as teachers, but also the students. It is a business but it isn't actually just selling. You're not selling beans off the shelf. . . . There's a whole lot of emotion and other stuff tied to it. The problem is where you get people who go too far. It's about going too far, I think, to the extremes, losing sight of people's emotional reactions. (principal lecturer, education, teaching university)

A Humanities faculty member at a new university in the UK, one that evolved from colleges and specialized institutes, reflected upon her changed environment. This new environment of a university lacked the collegial qualities of her former college, and manifested the characteristics of a university under new public management or new managerialism.

One of the things I didn't like about [my present] institution was its kind of sense of self-importance and one of the things that I did like about [my former institution] was the very collegiate atmosphere that I felt very strongly in place both as an undergraduate and as . . . a teacher. . . . I really felt very strongly that there wasn't a clear sort of hierarchy among academics and that we're all very collaborative and we're all very interested in each other's work in a very positive way. We had a very friendly relationship with our students. (senior lecturer, humanities, teaching university)

These faculty members identify changes in organizational priorities, a decreased interest in the human side of academia, and an increased hierarchy within universities as consequences of managerialism.

Autonomy, central to professionalism (Freidson, 2001), as well, is central to academic identity, and suggests that whether individual autonomy or collective academic autonomy, academics, according to academic logic (Levin, 2017), set their own agendas and are the producers of knowledge (Henkel, 2005). But, the ideal of autonomy is not realized by all. Rather, autonomy requires considerable academic capital, more often possessed by senior, well-established faculty (Henkel, 2005). Even at the more advanced academic levels, faculty autonomy is constrained by managerial interests of control. A senior lecturer at a teaching-oriented university in the UK notes that his work is determined by quantitative measures: the number of hours and days he has for research and scholarship.

We are given one hundred eighty-five hours a year, and that's an odd number—it equates to twenty-five working days, that's the nearest way it can be worked out—for scholarly and research activities. It's our time. And I designate twelve days of that for my editorship of the journal. . . . So, that's enough, but that's just about sufficient. We don't actually take twelve days. . . . So, those twenty-five days are for those sorts of activities. That's where we do our research; that's where we do our writing; it's where we go to conferences out of those days, and so on and so forth. Then, for the rest of the academic year, our academic year works on sixteen hundred and eleven hours. (senior lecturer, UK, teaching university)

For those 1,611 hours, this senior lecturer is not autonomous and is scheduled by his superiors (who are themselves academic professionals) to teach and evaluate, confer with students, work on curriculum, and carry out school-site visits. His colleague, a professor, has more latitude than the senior lecturer.*

I'm supposed to have a third of my work just for my own personal research, but I mean I'm just under pressure just like everyone else. I wouldn't say this year I've had a third of my time on my own work. My own work gets blurred you see, because those projects are bringing in income so, really, they are normal work. . . . I think I'm squashed for research time, not as much as other colleagues obviously. . . . I'm in a privileged position where I'm a research coordinator and that means I'm working for the research office in graduate school and I can shape policy. . . . I have a lot of freedom and I can shape policy and my own work very strongly. And so, I'm really lucky compared to many of my colleagues who are not in that situation. (professor, professional learning, UK, teaching university)

There is thus variability in autonomy for academics. Yet, within a larger context of a managerial or audit culture (Deem, 1998; Shore, 2008),

*In the UK, in general, faculty rank in the teaching and research career is organized as follows: from higher to lower rank, professor, reader, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, lecturer or clinical lecturer, and assistant lecturer.

academic professionals are controlled by neoliberal regimes, either at the institutional level (Lorenz, 2012) or state level (Ball, 2012). The UK professor, with his privileged position, nonetheless, is vulnerable in the same way as his less privileged colleagues. He is subject to the same evaluation system as his colleagues; his work is monitored; and, he has expectations from his university to produce. His university, similar to others in the UK, directed by a neoliberal state (Ball, 2012a), is both an object of neoliberal policies and a perpetuator of neoliberalism. His autonomy is in actuality pared down to his actions of resistance. “Neoliberalism is fully central to all UK education from K-12 to unis. There is no way to ignore it; the only option is to work within the system and reform it; resist where possible; and, speak out when necessary” (professor, UK, teaching university). Consequently, academic professional identity for the professor is fluid and autonomy is constrained. “Identity is understood . . . as part of the lived complexity of a person’s project and their way of being in those sites which are constituted as being part of the academy” (Clegg, 2008, p. 329). Academic professional identity even undergoing change processes is expected to be both authentic and legitimate (Archer, 2008). Yet, authenticity is undermined in a new managerial environment as is legitimacy (Archer, 2008).

The former unidimensional organizational conditions of the university of the 1960s to 1980s (conditions present in the United States and internationally) were assumed as what was fundamental or central, unique, or distinctive, and persistent or enduring about the organization (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). Stories or narratives that suggest congruency or isomorphism and contain those defining values and norms of the organization led to or supported legitimacy. This legitimacy contributed to or reinforced the self-esteem of members who in turn regarded their organization in a positive light (Humphreys & Brown, 2002). This academic logic, based upon elite sponsored identity narratives, however, was not congruent with individuals’ self-authored narratives, beginning in the era of Reagan and Thatcher (Shore, 2008), originating in the late 1970s. Thus, there were conflicting discourses of organizational identity, followed by negotiations to determine which discourse, or logic, dominated and whether or not the other discourses were accepted or adopted, or isolated, and whether or not they were attacked or shunned (Scharff, 2015). Indeed, the academic professional identity was in flux. We argue that this flux continues in the United States in the present as faculty members negotiate their identity every day in a multilogic institutional environment (we extend this topic and our theoretical standpoint regarding academic professional identity in chapter 1).

The neoliberal university, the corporate university, and the enterprise university were among the appellations for research universities internationally (Marginson & Considine, 2000; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2000) that conveyed the new logic of neoliberalism that not only entered but also commandeered the university. The questions that surround this new logic is whether or not it replaced or was amalgamated with the existing academic logic of the university.

Institutional Logics

The link between the academic professional and the institution of higher education, specifically the university, is symbiotic and indissoluble. The university, as an institution, sustains the academic profession and the academic profession sustains the university. Academic professional identity is formed within the university and structured by the institution. In addition, faculty are both actors and reflectors and producers and reproducers of the university's institutional logics. Thus, there is an interplay between the institution's logics and the individual's academic professional identity.

Organizational actors adhere to institutional values based upon a dominant institutional logic or logics (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2012). These logics are entrenched within an organization and give meaning to organizational life. Institutional logics underlie and sustain the purposes of the organization, and they shape organizational identity in the ways in which the actors embrace and enact these logics. Through these behaviors, stability in an organization is reinforced (Scott, 2014). These logics define the meanings attributed to organizational context and actions (Hinings, 2012). Institutional logics are "rule-like structures that constrain organizations or a set of cultural toolkits that provide opportunities for change in the existing structure and practices" (Thornton et al., 2012, p. 81); however, institutional logics are structures that can be altered.

New logics can enter the institution and give rise to a condition where multiple logics coexist, even collaborate, or compete.

The rise of new logics, or the existence of multiple logics, can create ambiguity and the concomitant need for sensemaking about the implications of logic change. Subsequently, action is taken to somehow cope with or resolve tensions or ambiguities linked to plural institutional logics. (Thornton et al., 2012, p. 142)

Institutional theorists claim that the presence of multiple logics in organizations is widespread (Besharov & Smith, 2014). Furthermore, these multiple logics coexist in various arrangements, including separation or amalgamation, or blending. “*When competing logics co-exist in an organizational field actors guided by different logics may maintain strong separate identities and engage in collaborations that result in mutually desirable outcomes and thus sustain the co-existing logics*” (Reay & Hinings, 2009, p. 646; italics in original). Furthermore, the mixing of logics, through amalgamation or blending, can lead to hybrid institutions (Thornton, Jones, & Kury, 2005), as a result of individual actors’ and organizations’ adoption of the logics of multiple sectors. For coexistence of two or more dominant logics within an institution, theorists note the necessity for compatibility of these dominant logics and that two logics together have low or non-centrality to the organization’s core features; that is, taken together they are not central to the organization’s functioning (Besharov & Smith, 2014). However, in cases where competing logics cannot coexist, one dominant logic replaces another.

For the contemporary university, logic compatibility or competition pertains to neoliberal logic and academic logic, what is understood as the foundational logic of the university. The entry of a market or neoliberal logic into the university, particularly through its vehicle of implementation, new managerialism (Deem, 1998), has challenged and indeed threatened the institutional logic of a university.

Academic Logic

Accounts of the effects of new managerialism, particularly in countries such as Australia, the UK, and Canada, and to some extent implied in those of the United States, rarely acknowledge the power of the traditions, historical values and practices, and taken-for-granted assumptions within the university. These we refer to as academic logic, the dominant value and meaning system, and its associated practices in universities. That is, universities contain a dominant logic, an academic logic, that through a common meaning system unites actors (Hinings, 2012).

There are numerous and distinctive characteristics of traditional universities, both ideals and norms. The ideals include the concept of collegiality: the “idea that university decisions can be made collectively by the academics affected, with the assistance and support of the administration” (Tight, 2014, p. 294). Clegg (2008) and other scholars add the exercise of

professional autonomy to the ideal of universities. Distinctive characteristics of universities generally include judgments based upon merit, academic freedom, professional and institutional autonomy, and bicameral governance (Levin, 2017). These are at the core of academic logic.

University values are an explicit topic in U.S. literature on higher education institutions, although there is no definite agreement on the main values or the number of values. The term *values* is used instead of institutional logic, although logic is more comprehensive and encapsulates values. Finkelstein et al. (2016) identified three “traditional core values central to faculty identity: academic freedom, autonomy, and shared governance” (p. 292). They broaden values to include those that pertained to academic work and careers, gleaned from Gappa, Austin, and Trice (2007): academic freedom and professional autonomy; collegiality and consensus; merit; opportunities for professional growth; and, flexibility in work arrangements. These values are components of academic logic but not the whole. Collegiality continues as an acknowledged or at least articulated core value in U.S. universities: the central value that characterizes the social and intellectual culture and provides for professional organizational cohesion (Haviland et al., 2017). This value reflects one of the main mechanisms in the operation of the professional bureaucracy (Mintzberg, 1991).

In the professional bureaucracy, or what Mintzberg also refers to as a meritocratic power configuration in organizations, management is symbolic (Mintzberg, 1983) and authority is meritocratic; that is, there is an internal coalition of experts, and power is centered internally and diffused among the experts on the basis of skills and knowledge (Mintzberg, 1983). Administrative power is limited; managers have “weak authority” (Mintzberg, 1983, p. 399) and serve at the discretion of the experts as liaisons between the internal professionals and external influencers—such as donors (Mintzberg, 1983). In the professional bureaucracy, any managerial attempts to intrude on the experts’ domain or manage their work are rejected. It is in the conditions of the professional bureaucracy that the values and academic logic of the university (autonomy, collegiality, academic freedom, and the like) thrive.

Academic logic forms and guides the ways these institutions function, administer, govern, and organize themselves: from their organization in units (e.g., departments, centers, schools, colleges, faculties), to the subjects of their curricula, to their emphasis upon research and the topics of their research, and to their policies and practices for admission of students. The university’s assumptions of its intellectual purpose and of its dissemination

of knowledge, both to students and the public, are taken for granted, but comprise its institutional logic.

Neoliberal Logic and Academic Logic

The logic of neoliberalism and academic logic are not compatible, certainly not in the view of most scholars. In neoliberalism, market principles are reinforced by the state: the state defines and regulates “social life through principles that come from the market” (Gane, 2012, p. 613). The neoliberal logic of competition, commodification, and performativity (Ball, 2012b) has entered the university in order to modify academic logic. At the most extreme limit, neoliberal logic threatens to replace academic logic, and this is the basis of the claim of scholars who articulate a world lost, even for those who did not label the cause neoliberal ideology (Readings, 1997; Wilshire, 1990). At a more modest level, neoliberal logic has entered the university through integration or segregation—that is, either neoliberal logic has integrated with academic logic or neoliberal logic occupies the university, segregated from academic logic. New managerialism, documented in the UK and in European countries (Deem & Brehony, 2005), is one manifestation of neoliberal logic; academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), noted in the United States, is another.

Academic actors (faculty and academic administrators such as department chairs and deans) who live out these logics and their conflicts in U.S. universities recognize alterations in university expectations and in their practices. Indeed, faculty act in accord with neoliberal principles (Levin & Aliyeva, 2015) in efforts to acquire research grants that provide financial support to their university, in self-monitoring their own performance in areas of productivity, and in taking on more work, including more students in classes (Finkelstein et al., 2016). Department chairs at both research and comprehensive universities articulate the demands placed upon them for efficiency, revenue generation, and productivity for their department members (Levin, López Damián, Martin, & Morales Vázquez, 2017). Deans at research universities acknowledge the imperatives for them to produce outcomes consistent with their universities’ goals, such as national and international prominence, research grant acquisition, and private financial donations (Martin, 2018). Yet, simultaneously, academics extol the merits of their academic professional identity: for faculty, their autonomy and academic freedom; for

department chairs, protection of the academic values of their departments; and, for research university deans, the importance of maintaining their own research, in the face of demands for increased managerial work.

The Managerial University

In contrast to the notion of the professional bureaucracy is the managerial university, a manifestation of neoliberal logic. Features of the managerial university include the elimination of (or efforts to eliminate) professional bureaucratic processes and procedures and the pursuit of teamwork, flexibility, efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, financial targets, audits, performance indicators, and benchmarks (Deem & Brehony, 2005). These behaviors and goals are driven by managers with a “right to manage” (Deem & Brehony, 2005, p. 220) who elevate the activities of management to a level of supremacy “above all other activities” (Deem & Brehony, 2005, p. 220). The managerial university implies and emphasizes a “myth of a community of scholars” (Levin, 2000, pp. 32–33), that such a collegial environment was an illusion. In the managerial university, managers have primary authority over decision making and usurp power from the professional experts (the faculty) through increased surveillance of faculty work, audits of teaching and research, the introduction of devolved budgets and cost centers, and outcomes-based reforms (Deem & Brehony, 2005). The managerial model is in direct contradiction to the professional bureaucratic model, as it redefines the structure of power, dissolves both trust and autonomy, and reorients professional experts into “marginalized” and “overly managed” (Deem, Hillyard, & Reed, 2007, p. 49) individuals. The managerial model is a manifestation of a managerial regime that goes hand in hand with neoliberal ideology.

In the managerial university, the goal is to shape academics into entrepreneurial subjects and all organizational members into managers. “[E]ntrepreneurial subject[s] relate to themselves as if they were a business, are active, embrace risks, capably manage difficulties and hide injuries” (Scharff, 2015, p. 2). Academics are expected to ensure that the university increases its revenues, status, and prestige, that is, its marketable image. For individuals, “social critique is transformed into self-critique, resulting in a prevalence of self-doubt and anxiety” (Scharff, 2015, p. 2).

At the level of serious critique of the managerial university and its ideological home of neoliberalism, there is no remedy to or justification for the subordination of academic logic, either at the organizational level or the