

Krystian SZADKOWSKI

**University's Third Mission as a Challenge
to Marxist Theory**

CPP RPS Volume 36 (2013)

Correspondence to the Author:

Krystian Szadkowski, MA
Institute of Philosophy
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland
ul. Szamarzewskiego 89
60-569 Poznan, Poland
e-mail: szadkowski.k@gmail.com

A list of the Center for Public Policy Studies “Research Papers” and other currently published publications is available online at the CPP website
<http://www.cpp.amu.edu.pl/publications.htm>.

Hard copies of the research papers are available upon request

The Center for Public Policy Studies (CPP) is an autonomous research unit of Poznan University, Poland, founded in 2002. It focuses on research in social sciences, mostly through large-scale comparative European and international research projects. Its major areas of interest include: higher education policy and research in national, European and global perspectives; research and development policies; university management and governance; reforming higher education and its legislation in Central and Eastern Europe; higher education and regional development; public services; the processes of Europeanization and globalization; theories of the welfare state; theories of democracy, as well as political and economic transition in European postcommunist countries. See <http://www.cpp.amu.edu.pl/htm>.

The CPP Research Papers Series is intended to disseminate the findings of work in progress and to communicate preliminary research results to the academic community and the wider audience. Papers are subject to further revisions and therefore all comments and suggestions to authors are welcome.

Abstract

This article is based on a literature review, and makes an effort to contextualize an emerging stream of higher education research (critical university studies, Marxist higher education research), to mark some challenges posed by the rise of the university's third mission to the Marxist theory of education, and finally, to modestly contribute to this new stream of research by proposing a brief conceptualization of these third mission activities as seen from a Marxist perspective. First, I will very briefly outline how and when comparative higher education emerged and what kinds of topics it focused on. Second, I will present the major conceptualizations of European universities' third mission activities and link them with the ongoing New Public Management reforms in the sector. Third, I will discuss the idea of critical university studies and their main representatives. Finally, I would like to focus on their Marxist branch.

KRYSTIAN SZADKOWSKI

UNIVERSITY'S THIRD MISSION AS A CHALLENGE TO MARXIST THEORY

The emergence of higher education research

Higher education research emerged and became important in a period of economic and political turbulence¹ similar to the times we are now living in, i.e. during the current financial crisis. In his classical article, Burton R. Clark (2008), the founding father of contemporary higher education research², pointed out that the sociology of higher education emerged during the first quarter of a century after World War II, at the end of the 1960's, when the sector itself started to gain importance among wider populations and economic and political elites (OECD 1970). This newfound importance was due to a shift toward a mass – and even universal (in the United States) – access to a university education, demanded and won by social and students' movements, as well as the growing significance of innovation and knowledge in developed capitalist economies. Clark indicates two streams of pre-war research at universities, one that started with the Weberian interest in the rise of bureaucratic management and specialization in the sciences (Weber 1948), and the second rooted in the work of Thorstein Veblen that focused on the impact of business logic on university administration and forms of control in the higher education sector (Veblen 2003). Although these two streams were never directly developed, they underpinned the institutionalized sociology of higher education that started in the 1960's in, according to the author of *Higher Education System*, two main directions: a) study of inequality in higher education; b) more psychologically oriented study of the effects of students' university experiences (e.g. impact of campus life). This second stream was connected with the students' appearance as political actors in Western societies. Two additional lines of inquiry (rather minor in the 1960's) were:

¹ In the middle of the 1990s, Ulrich Teichler claimed that: "It is obvious that a sense of crisis as regards higher education was a major factor or possibly the most important single factor stimulating the promotion and the institutionalization of higher education research in Europe" (Teichler 1996: 434).

² Also referred to as "sociology of higher education", see. Gumport, 2007.

a) research on academic profession's; b) research on universities as organizations (and their networked connection in the form of national higher education systems)³. Those two small fields came to the fore and grew over the next decades and, at the moment; they constitute the most important domains of mainstream higher education research, as well as holding crucial value for the development of Marxist higher education studies. However, Clark clearly stated that, in general, the future of any higher education research depends on its ability to develop techniques of comparative inquiry.

Ulrich Teichler (1996: 434-435) mapped the themes addressed between the 1960's and the 1980's by the higher education research centres that emerged in Europe; they can be summarized as follows: at the beginning of the 1960s, the relationship between educational investment and economic growth, and issues related to this sector's expansion – institutional diversification and equality of opportunity – were priorities. Then, as a consequence of student protests in the late 1960s, student centred approaches in curricula, teaching methods and guidance were closely investigated. Hereafter, in the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s, more attention was paid to the employment problems of university graduates.

Higher education research lost its political and societal importance for a short period of time at the beginning of the 1980s, mainly due to a lack of innovation in the sector. Nevertheless, starting in the mid-1980s, a rise in strong state supervision, the subject of Neave's *evaluative state* (2012: 36-47), of more and more managerial and entrepreneurial universities in Western Europe (especially in France, the Netherlands and Great Britain), as well as the emergence and constitution of a knowledge-based society and economy, also accompanied by a growing internationalization of higher education, research in this field once again moved to the top of the agenda. However, as Teichler suggested, this did not lead to a substantial increase in quality but, rather, to a growth in the number of evaluation reports, consultancy practices and expert commissions; that is, in other words, an increase in the production of knowledge about the sector for the mere purpose of control (Teichler 2005: 466). As time went on, academic higher education research developed and, in the 1990s, broke from the monopoly of

³ In her efficiently composed edited volume, Patricia J. Gumport (2007: 17-50) adds to Clark's list another four currently evolving dimensions of higher education sociology that are: a) institutional research; b) studies of academic departments; c) research on ethnic and race diversity in higher education; d) higher education policy studies.

international comparative research held by organizations like the OECD, UNESCO and the World Bank (however, those structures still play a leading role in this field today). Together with the proliferation of knowledge-based employment and the development of knowledge-intensive industries, information about the higher education sector gained strategic importance for business, as well as for governmental circles. Teichler claims that, due to this interest, one of the main problems with comparative research is its dominantly political, rather than economic, sponsorship that research strategies must approach and tackle systematically (Teichler 1996: 433).

Fundamental changes in European higher education and the rise of the third mission

Over the last few decades, higher education all over the globe – especially in Europe – has undergone a paradigmatic transformation (see. Altbach et al. 2009, Kwiek 2013). These changes are often categorized under different labels like: the rise of the production of knowledge in Mode 2 (Gibbons et al. 1994), the second academic revolution (Etzkowitz 2002: 9-19), the rise of the entrepreneurial university (Clark 1998, 2004), the growing complexity of academic enterprise (Kwiek 2012) and the results of engaging worldwide higher education systems into the stage of universal access (Trow 2010). Universities globally are getting more and more attention, both from students, policymakers, businesses and local communities. They deserve it, because they have larger numbers of students than ever before, they employ more and more faculty, they play crucial roles in the economic development of the regions and cities they are located in and they cooperate closely with national and transnational industries. Today, their contributions to the environments they operate in go far beyond the traditional tasks of teaching and research. However, what is clear is that standard university characteristics should be elaborated and revised in the light shed by such alterations, and this is, in fact, done in the vast literature on the subject.

In the European Commission's main strategic documents, European universities are perceived as being able to contribute substantially to the development (both societal and economic) of the regions where they are located in (See for example: EC 2006, 2011). Therefore, the number of university stakeholders grows and their needs multiply. In order to secure their

own position, and very often also their financial interests, universities must meet these growing demands, and increasingly they do so. The set of these activities is often labelled as the “third mission”, a critical (but not new) dimension of university operations. In general terms, the third mission could be defined as a set of “actions geared towards ‘knowledge transfer’, forging links with industry and commercialising university research and teaching” (McLauchlan, Shore 2012: 268). Marek Kwiek provides a catalogue of five dimensions of the third mission (2012b) and four of them are directly linked to contributions for economic growth: 1) the regional mission, meaning opening universities to the cultural, societal and economic aspirations of their local surroundings; 2) academic entrepreneurialism, that lays at the very heart of the third mission and could be defined as: “a processes through which public universities are seeking financial self-reliance through non-core non-state income.” (Kwiek 2012b: 73); 3) the “service to the society”, that is a response to the needs of the social and economic environment, whether they be demands for a skilled labour force, policy consultancy or practical and problem-solution oriented research for industry; 4) the civic mission, public-good oriented and usually focused on elevating the populations’ awareness and publicly engaging citizens (the latter is the only quality that, according to Kwiek, is irrelevant for economic growth, and is usually neglected or marginalized from mainstream public policy); 5) innovation, a key function, especially for research-intensive universities.

Schoen, together with colleagues, conceptualized third mission activities around eight dimensions: four economic in nature, four societal in character. In this first category, we find the following aspects: 1) the development of human resources or, in other words, valorisation of human capital, i.e. preparation of a highly skilled labour force that gains experience through participation in research in collaboration with industry; 2) the production of intellectual property, codification of produced knowledge via patents and copyright; 3) the creation of spin-off companies, entities devoted solely to knowledge transfer; 4) direct contracts with industry. Societal activities embrace another four subsequent dimensions: 1) contracts with public bodies, i.e. the “service to society” dimension of research activities; 2) participation in policy making; 3) involvement in social and cultural life, taking place mostly in the cities universities are located in, and 4) increasing public understanding of science, based on interaction with society and the dissemination of research results.

Their proposition is much more clear-cut than Kwiek's. However, it is prone to falling into dangerous binaries (economic vs. social, etc.). Nevertheless, this perspective will be useful in the next part of this article, when we will attempt to present a Marxist categorization of the university's third mission activities. But I will come back to this discussion later on.

The rise of the European universities' third mission was accompanied and directly interrelated with the reforms from the sign of the New Public Management (NPM) (Bleiklie et. al. 2011) that were (starting from Great Britain, France, and the Netherlands) and still are (for example recently in the Polish higher education system (Czarnecki 2013) introduced in most European countries. They were and are introduced in order to increase the effectiveness of public higher education institutions and to seize public control and the direction of increasingly autonomous universities. However, this control is not exercised directly, in a centralist way, but rather through a subtle form of open coordination. Ferlie and colleagues (2008) described a few possible and observable consequences of NPM reforms in the field of higher education systems. First and foremost, market and quasi-market relations were created in the sector by stimulating competition between institutions (for resources, both private and public), researchers and students. Real market prices for teaching and research was established or developed in order to allow for market exchange. Introduction or the increase of students' tuition fees is taking place in order to foster market behaviours among the clients of education services (i.e. students). Systems of public financial control develop and harden, management at the institutional level gains more power, explicit measurement and performance monitoring in both research and teaching develop, and there is a concentration of public funding in favourably performing institutions. The growth of performance-related pay is also a possible development (Ferlie et al. 2008: 335-336).

All of these changes are redefining the power relations in higher education institutions in the interest of management and the relevant Ministries that allocate budgets and are responsible for establishing conditions of employment. They also create new divisions and tensions among faculty and management, as well as among academics themselves. The relationship between the university and its workforce then becomes similar to that of capital and labour. A new higher education research stream is consequently more than necessary in order to reflect

upon these developments and empower a different university stakeholder (i.e. the faculty) in their daily working lives in third mission-oriented higher education institutions.

The rise of critical university studies

Ulrich Teichler once wrote that: “The more the researchers succeed in taking into consideration the diverse perspectives of the various actors in the research design and the interpretation of the findings, the more research on higher education is conceptually appropriate as well as potentially useful for practical problem-solving” (1996: 439). Following his advice, we can postulate here that contemporary higher education research thus requires more focus on university knowledge workers, their processes of political organization and mobilization, as well as the conflict relationships that they are embedded in their workplaces. Recently, in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, American scholar Jeffery J. Williams⁴ (2012) coined a useful term for describing the emerging critical trend in research in higher education that has been trying to respond to that growing need⁵. His perspective is maybe limited in scope – he refers to authors and phenomena from the United States’ higher education sector only – however, it is worth consideration here. Together with a graduate student, they use the category of “critical university studies”⁶ to name research practices that have the university as a point of reference, are interdisciplinary in their method and, being critical, focus on the ways in which certain kinds of transformation in contemporary universities “serve power or wealth and contribute to injustice or inequality rather than social hope”. Scholars that are part of this stream are recruited from the fields of education, history,

⁴ Williams himself comes from the field of cultural studies and works mainly on the issue of student debt (Williams 2006, 2008, 2009).

⁵ The academic profession studies, that lay at the core of contemporary higher education research, have nearly 30 years of history and consists of a vast set of literature (see. for example: Clark 1987, Kogan et al. 1994, Altbach 2003, Kogan and Teichler 2007, Enders and de Weert 2009.), however at the moment they are at the stage of the reorientation of their research agenda (Musselin 2011: 444) starting to focus more and more on the casualization of the academic workplace and linking it with the wider transformations of labour relationships in the economy (Standing 2011). Knowledge worker, a figure recognized and deployed in analysis by academic profession studies, is extended by the critical university studies stream, and it covers doctoral candidates, students or nearly every worker employed in knowledge-intensive occupations. Then, the university is here perceived as a crucial node for knowledge workers formation and mobilization.

⁶ It is worth to mention here that in 2010 “Globalization, Societies and Education” published a full thematic journal issue devoted to “critical higher education studies”, that at its core has “a close examination of who actually has a say in defining the function of higher education” (Hartmann 2010: 171).

cultural studies, sociology and sociology of work. Williams claims that the first efforts in the field of critical university studies emerged in the 1990s, together with the works of Lawrence C. Soley (1995), Bill Readings (1996), Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997), and was devoted to the critical reception of the first signs of corporatization of the university and the rise of its entrepreneurial forms in an American context. However, we have to stress that critical university studies are not solely an academic endeavour. They are rooted in and interlinked to the various political activities of university stakeholders, mainly: student movements, actions aiming at the unionization of graduate students or academic trade unions of adjuncts and precarious university employees. So we could say, in reference to Clark's triangle of coordination, that the representatives of critical university studies are witness to the ongoing move of national higher education systems from a public perspective to market orientation. These studies take sides with and favour the different experience of political coordination connected with the process of the hardening of internal interests (Clark 1983: 150-158). In other words, this is a captious analysis that underpins its reference points in the processes of "unmaking the public university", as Christopher Newfield named the current transformations in the higher education sector in the United States (2008). The main areas of interest of this stream of higher education research are: 1) academic capitalism (Slaughter and Rhodes 2004) and the processes of corporatization (Aronowitz 2000); 2) deterioration of academic work (the proletarianization of faculty) (Powelson 2011) and managerialism (Martin 2011); 3) unionization (Krause et al. 2008); and 4) student debt (Ross 2010). However, affiliation to this research stream is usually not based on self-identification⁷. Moreover, critical university studies differ from the traditional history of education or various philosophical investigations of the idea of education. They point out that the university is not at all a neutral institution and it serves hegemonic, social and economic interests. It is an argument against two competitive narratives that are dominantly perceived as vehement opposites but that, in reality, are two sides of the same coin. The first is an assumption of the existence of the pure autonomy of knowledge creation and is related to the postulate of its separation from any kind of economic production process. This is an ideal narration of a meritocratic academic oligarchy (Shapin 2012). The second refers to all market-oriented

⁷ This is for example the case of Sheila Slaughter, Larry Leslie or Garry Rhoades who for decades have belonged to main stream higher education research. However, they constitute its internal critical part (see. Slaughter 2001) and without hesitation could be assigned to the research stream discussed above as its founding fathers.

neoliberal economic approaches that see the university as an engine for a knowledge-based society⁸. What these two narratives have in common is an essentialist belief in the existence of abstract knowledge that can be separated from the social embedment of subjects that produce it. Critical university studies propose going beyond such false opposition and connect knowledge production processes with the activities of social and faculty movements⁹.

Third mission activities from a Marxist higher education research perspective

Marxist higher education research can be presented as a radical branch of critical university studies. It is quite a new phenomenon and has, at the moment, rather few representatives¹⁰. It is probably caused by the fact that references to the sphere of education are extremely rare in the corpus of Marx's writings¹¹. Remarks on university and higher education appear even less often, and it is doubtful if they have any importance at all. We could then pose a valid question: is there a valuable reason to look at contemporary higher education systems through a Marxian lens? At first the answer seems obvious: no, there isn't any. From this point of view, perhaps all that one needs to analyze the role of the university in capitalist society is to be found in Althusser's (1971) writings on *Ideological State Apparatuses* (ISA). As a part of educational ISA ("the system of different public and private 'schools'" (Althusser 1971: 143)), higher education plays its role in the reproduction process for the conditions for

⁸ One of the examples of such a discourse could be drawn from the OECD works on higher education. See. For example, OECD 2007.

⁹ Paradoxically, this is one of the extreme, reductionist ways to understand the university's third mission as civic engagement.

¹⁰ Two most renowned Marxist scholars who deal with higher education are Harry Cleaver (see. Cleaver 2004) and Gigi Roggero (see. Roggero 2011). Different scholars from all around the world were also gathered in the pioneer project of the Edu-factory (2009). However, we have to emphasize that, according to Teichler's categories, we would classify these academics as "discipline-department based occasional researchers on higher education" (Teichler 1996: 433).

¹¹ See. For example Marx 1960: 398. [On the benefits and limitations of private and public education]; Marx 1967: 267 [on the costs of education in relation to the value of labor-power] and Marx 1976: 610-635 [on the role and function of compulsory education in Factory Acts]. A good summary of Marx and Engels's account on education could be found in a brief article by Colin Waugh (2010).

production, reproducing skills of labour power, and simultaneously “its submission to the rules of the established order” (Althusser 1971: 132). More approaches could be found in Marxist pedagogies that treat university education like just another area of education, but they seem to be rather insufficient¹². As we claim in this article, current changes in the sector of higher education systems pose a considerable challenge for Marxist theories and, despite the fact that Althusser’s classical approach still seems to be useful in many ways, it is certainly not sufficient and must be supplemented.

An initial impulse to formulate a structured discipline can be seen in the comparably young Marxist organization studies (Adler 2010). This discipline is characterized by an emphasis on the idea that relations of production establish the primary axis of social hierarchies and determine the broad pattern of economic opportunities of the members of societies (2010: 64-65). Scholars from this field focus on the “conflictual aspects of the employment relation, and their ramifications for the structure and functioning of organizations” (2010: 72). And due to the crucial role played in Marxist theory by an analysis of exploitation and class antagonism, control and management is the central question of Marxist organization studies (2010: 74). However, the biggest challenge is posed by the necessity to come to terms with the productive (in the Marxian sense) character of academic work. It seems, however, that a close look at Marx’s writings will help to identify a number of doors through which we could pass in keeping with Marx’s ideas and simultaneously being able to understand the dynamics of imposing productivity on sectors such as higher education and cultural industries by capital.

An important clue can be found in the pages of the first volume of *Capital*, in the chapter on *Absolute and Relative Surplus-Value* where we find Marx discussing the character of productive and unproductive labour with regards to education (1976: 644). Marx referred to a schoolmaster’s work as directly productive for capitalism. He wrote that his labour is productive when he works in order to bring profit for the owner or management of the institution where he is employed. For Marx, then, there is no substantial difference between investment of capital in the “knowledge factory” or the “sausage factory”. Both of them are spaces where productive labour and the production of surplus value take place and, due to that

¹² A good overview of the Marxist and post-Marxist pedagogy’s account on education is to be found in Adam Wright’s article (Wright 2013).

fact, tensions, power relations and exploitation appear as well. This is rather obvious in the case of private for-profit providers, but how one could assume that in regard to public universities?

Public universities, despite their formally non-profit character, in the age of third mission dominance and NPM reforms are seeking for additional sources of revenue beyond public subsidies. The shift in European public universities towards income diversification is clear, according to various empirical studies, and multiple third mission activities play an important role in this process (see. CHEPS 2010, Jongbloed and de Boer 2012). The entrepreneurial-oriented public university is a fact and it is more and more used as a template in the development and implementation of reforms that are trying to turn the “university into an engine of the knowledge economy” all over the world. It is a hybrid form that is neither public nor private, neither state agency, nor a pure capitalist enterprise (Enders, Jongbloed 2007: 20). The success of such a university relies on the level of autonomy an institution has in relation to its own staff and possibilities of allocation and investment of its funds. Clark Kerr, the former president of the University of California, said that the entrepreneurial response of the public university is all about gaining and maintaining institutional autonomy (Kerr 1993). This kind of autonomy has balanced but diversified sources of income at its core and financially speaking, such self-reliance lies in a broad portfolio of income sources. According to Burton Clark (2004), the diversified funding base of an entrepreneurial university splits into: 1) *other than core-support government sources* 2) *private organized sources* 3) *university-generated income*. Such a university could rely on the following sources:

public core-support from national and/or provincial ministries, support from other national agencies, support from public agencies at other government levels, support from large business firms, engagement with small and medium-size firms, particularly spin-offs, philanthropic foundations, large and small, professional associations (for professional development education), university endowment income, university fund-raising from alumni and willing supporters, student tuition and fees, applied to foreign students, graduate students, continuing education students, student tuition and fees, domestic undergraduate students, earned income from campus operations, a varied array of academically driven activities plus spun-off, stand-alone and self-financing

activities, royalty income from patented and licensed inventions and intellectual property (Clark 2004: 174).

As we have seen, only a part of these could be treated as public subsidies. Thus, we can finally start categorizing core third mission activities (those from the four economic dimensions of the third mission). According to Marx, wage, rent and profit are the three major categories of the distribution of revenue created during the processes of production in a capitalist economy. Wages are the monetary form used to pay workers for their labour power (teachers and/or researchers receive wages for the teaching and research work they have done). Profit is the form of the extraction of surplus value from the net product produced by the workers that is sold for more than the level of wages they received (when the university as an institution mediates between the clients and sellers of the labour power of its employees it usually generates a profit). Finally, capitalist rent, according to Carlo Vercellone, is “the result of a process of expropriation of the social conditions of production and reproduction”, a way to concentrate resources and not increase them, and it “presents itself as a credit or a right to the ownership of some material and immaterial resource that grant a right to drawing value from a position of exteriority in respect to production” (Vercellone 2007) (limiting the accessibility of knowledge resources that universities produce in order to gain revenue from selling access to them is a rent-based activity). From the perspective of higher education institutions that engage in various third mission activities, the four dimensions of the economic side of the “third mission”, formulated by Shoen and colleagues (2006), divide then into two categories: profit generating activities (development of human resources through tuition-based teaching, direct contract with industry) and rent generating activities (production of intellectual property, spin-offs). The remaining four aspects of the societal side of the third mission could be classified using two other categories: the production of the public (contract with public bodies, participation in public policy making) and the production of the commons (involvement in social and cultural life, public understanding of science). But this is material for a separate investigation.

Conclusion

This article has thrown up many questions in need of further investigation. However, I hope to have at least connected the discussion of the current changes in the European higher education sector with wider concepts drawn from a critical Marxist tradition. There is still a long road to be travelled by critical or Marxist higher education research in order to fill the meritocratic gap between themselves and institutionalized streams of higher education research. Nonetheless, we are living in the second century of Marxism, as Enrique Dussel once called our contemporariness (2003: xxxiii), and only through recourse to Marx are we able to rediscover a scientific thinking that can be used today, even more so than in the 19th century, for a critique of globalized capitalism in its current state of crisis and a higher education system that is a productive and crucial part of it. As Harry Cleaver has pointed out:

Retrospectively, every historical crisis of capital brought on by the political recomposition of the working class, has involved a crisis for Marxist theory in the sense that it has implied transformations in qualitative organization of capital relation and thus need to rethink the scope and redefine the content of Marxist categories so that their interpretation remains adequate to understanding changes in the dynamics and to the elaboration of strategy (Cleaver 2003: 41)

I find the project of developing Marxist higher education research an important part of the task for overcoming the crisis of Marxism. However these are stakes to be won in this endeavour by the Marxist tradition itself. But is there anything to be gained from mutual contact by contemporary higher education research? Certainly the answer is: yes, there is. As Altbach (1997: 6) maintains, the strength of higher education research relies on its open and interdisciplinary character, as well as the fact that every single research conducted in its field from within a different discipline (in our case – from the perspective of Marxist tradition) is able to enrich it. What Marxist tradition brings to the table is a complex and subtle conceptual machine for the analysis of labour relations within and without the academic workplace. It could be successfully deployed in the analysis of what Christine Musselin calls the late industrialisation of academic activities (2007: 182), which is the state of academic enterprise in the era of the rise of the university's third mission. Musselin also suggests that: "the ongoing transformations of the academic profession require us to adopt our research questions to new issues. Mainly, to the extension of non-tenure-track staff and a redefinition of the

analysis of the new careers and trajectories for academics and how they can be related to the overall transformation of work in our societies. (2011: 444). In this process of the reorientation of the research agenda in a Marxist approach, with its expertise in the analysis of the transformation of work in cognitive capitalism (Hardt and Negri 2009, Boutang 2011) could become a suitable guide for higher education research¹³. Nevertheless, the further development of this potentially fruitful connection of perspectives is the author's future research task.

¹³ One existing successful example of the of this perspective from the field of mainstream higher education research is to be found in Roar Høstaker and Agnete Vabø (2005).

References

- Adler, Paul S. (2010). "Marx and Organization Studies Today". In. P. S. Adler (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Sociology and Organization Studies: Classical Foundations*. Oxford: University Press. 62-91.
- Altbach, Philip G. et al. (2009), *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*, Paris 2009.
- Altbach, Philip G. (ed.) (2003). *The Decline of the Guru. The Academic Profession in the Third World*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Althusser, Luis (1971). "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigation)" [in:] *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. B. Brewster, New York: Monthly Review Press 1971. 127-186.
- Aronowitz, Stanley (2000). *The Knowledge Factory. Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bleiklie, Ivar et al, "New Public Management, Network Governance and the University as a Changing Professional Organization". In. *The Ashgate Research Companion to New Public Management*, eds. T. Christensen, P. Lægred, Farnham: Ashgate. 161-175.
- Boutang, Yann M. (2011). *Cognitive Capitalism*. Trans. E. Emery. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- CHEPS (2010). *Progress in higher education reform across Europe - Funding Reforms, Volume 1: Executive Summary and main report*. Brussels.
- Clark, Burton R. (1983). *Higher Education System*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Burton R. (eds.) (1987). *The Academic Profession. National, Disciplinary and Institutional Settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Burton R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities*, Bingley: Emerald.
- Clark, Burton R. (2004). *Sustaining Change in Universities. Continuities in case studies and concepts*, Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Clark, Burton R. (2008). "Development of the Sociology of Higher Education". In Clark, Burton R. *On Higher Education. Selected Writings 1956-2006*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 169-182.
- Cleaver, Harry (2004). "On Schoolwork and the Struggle Against It". <http://libcom.org/files/On%20Schoolwork1.pdf>
- Cleaver, Harry (2004). "Marxian Categories, the Crisis of Capital and the Constitution of Social Subjectivity Today" In. W. Bonefeld (ed.) *Revolutionary Writing: Common Sense Essays in Post-Political Politics*, New York: Autonomedia 2003. 39-72.
- Czarnecki, Krzysztof 2013. "Nowe Zarządzanie Publiczne a reforma szkolnictwa wyższego w Polsce". "Praktyka Teoretyczna" 1(7) (forthcoming).
- Dussel, Enrique (2001). *Towards an Unknown Marx. A commentary on the Manuscripts of 1861-1863*, trans. Y. Angulo, London: Routledge.
- EC. European Commission (2006). "Delivering on the Modernisation Agenda for Universities: Education, Research and Innovation". Brussels. COM (2006) 208 final

- EC. European Commission (2011). "Supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernization of Europe's higher education systems". Brussels. COM (2011)567.
- Edu-factory (2009). *Toward a Global Autonomous University*, New York: Autonomedia.
- Enders, Jürgen, Ben Jongbloed (2007). "The Public, the Private and the Good in Higher Education and Research: an Introduction". In. J. Enders, B. Jongbloed (eds.) *Public-Private Dynamics in Higher Education. Expectations, Developments and Outcomes*. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. 9-36.
- Enders, Jürgen, Egbert de Weert, (eds.) (2009). *The Changing Face of Academic Life: Analytical and Comparative Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Etzkowitz, Henry (2002). *MIT and the Rise of Entrepreneurial Science*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ferlie, Ewan et al. (2008). "The steering of higher education systems: a public management perspective". "Higher Education" 56. 325-348.
- Gibbons, Michael et al. (1994). *The New Production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Gumport, Patricia J. (ed.) (2007). *Sociology of Higher Education: Contributions and Their Contexts*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hardt, Michael, Antonio Negri (2009). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hartmann, Eva (2010). "The new research agenda in critical higher education studies". "Globalisation, Societies and Education". Vol. 8, No. 2. 169–173.
- Høstaker, Roar, Agnete Vabø (2005). „Higher Education and the Transformation to a Cognitive Capitalism". In. I. Bleiklie, M. Henkel (eds.) *Governing Knowledge. A Study of Continuity and Change in Higher Education. A Festschrift in Honour of Maurice Kogan*. Dodrecht: Springer. 227-244.
- Jongbloed, Ben, Harry de Boer (2012). "Higher Education Funding Reforms in Europe and the 2006 Modernisation Agenda". In. M. Kwiek, A. Kurkiewicz (eds.). *The Modernisation of European Universities. Cross-National Academic Perspectives*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. 126-148.
- Kerr, Clark (1993). "Universal issues in the development of higher education". In. J. B. Balderston, F. E., Balderston (eds.). *Higher Education in Indonesia: Evolution and Reform*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 19-35.
- Kogan, Maurice et al. (1994), *Staffing Higher Education: Meeting New Challenges*. London and Bristol: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kogan, Maurice and Ulrich Teichler (eds.) (2007). *Key Challenges to the Academic Profession*. Paris and Kassel.
- Krause, Monika et al. (eds.) (2008). *The University Against Itself. The NYU Strike and the Future of the Academic Workplace*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kwiek, Marek (2013). *Knowledge Production in European Universities. States, Markets, and Academic Entrepreneurialism*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Kwiek, Marek (2012a). „The Growing Complexity of the Academic Enterprise in Europe: A Panoramic View”. „European Journal of Higher Education” Vo. 2. No. 2-3. 112-131.
- Kwiek, Marek (2012b). „Universities, Regional Development and Economic Competitiveness: The Polish Case”. In. R. Pinheiro, P. Benneworth, G.A. Jones (eds.). *Higher Education and Regional Development: An Assessment of Tensions and Contradictions*, London: Routledge. 69-85.
- Leslie, Larry, Sheila Slaughter (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Martin, Randy (2011). *Under New Management. Universities, Administrative Labor and Professional Turn*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Marx, Karl (1960). “On General Education”. In. MECW Volume 21, Moscow.
- Marx, Karl (1976), *Capital. Volume 1*, trans. B. Fowkes, London: New Left Review.
- McLauchlan, Laura and Cris Shore, (2012). „‘Third mission’ activities, commercialisation and academic entrepreneurs”. „Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale”, Vol 20, No 3. 267-286.
- Musselin, Christine (2011). „The Academic Workplace. What We Already Know. What We Still Do Not Know, and What We Would Like to Know”. In. D. Rhoten and C. Calhoun (eds.). *Knowledge Matters. The Public Mission of the Research University*. New York: Columbia University Press. 423-457.
- Musselin, Christine (2008). „Towards a Sociology of Academic Work” In. A. Amaral, et al. (eds.) *From Governance to Identity. A Festschrift for Mary Henkel*, Dodrecht: Springer. 47-56.
- Musselin, Christine (2007). „The Transformation of Academic Work: Facts and Analysis”. In. M. Kogan, U. Teichler. *Key Challenges to the Academic Profession*. Paris and Kassel. 175-190.
- Neave, Guy (2012), *The Evaluative State, Institutional Autonomy and Re-engineering Higher Education in Western Europe. The Prince and His Pleasure*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Newfield, Christopher (2008). *Unmaking the Public University. The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- OECD (1970). *Development of Higher Education, 1950–1967: Statistical Survey*. Paris.
- OECD (2007), *Higher Education and Regions, Globally Competitive, Locally Engaged*, Paris.
- Powelson, Michael W. (2011). "The Proletarianization of the Academy: California State University-Northridge and the California Budget Crisis". "Workplace" 18. 10-24.
- Readings, Bill (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rhoades, Garry, Sheila Slaughter (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy. Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Roggero, Gigi (2011). *The Production of Living Knowledge: the Crisis of the University and the Transformation of Labor in Europe and North America*. trans. E. Brophy, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Ross, Andrew (2012). "Are Student Loans Immoral?". <http://www.edu-factory.org/wp/are-student-loans-immoral/> (Access: 30 1 2013)
- Schoen, Antoine et al. (2006). *Strategic Management of University Research Activities, Methodological Guide*, PRIME Project 'Observatory of the European University'.
- Shapin, Stephen (2012). "The Ivory Tower: the history of a figure of speech and its cultural uses". "The British Journal for the History of Science" 45(1). 1–27.
- Slaughter, Sheila (2001). "Problems in comparative higher education: Political economy, political sociology and postmodernism". "Higher Education" 41. 389–412.
- Soley, Lawrence C. (1995). *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia*. Boston: South End Press.
- Standing, Guy (2011). *The Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Teichler, Ulrich (1996). "Comparative higher education: potentials and limits", "Higher Education" 32. 431-465.
- Teichler, Ulrich (2005). "Research on Higher Education in Europe". "European Journal of Education" Vol. 40, No. 4. 447-469.
- Trow, Martin (2010). "Problems in the Transition from Elite to Mass Higher Education". In *Twentieth-Century Higher Education: Elite to Mass to Universal*, ed. M. Burrage, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 86-142.
- Vercellone, Carlo (2007). "The new articulation of wages, rent and profit in cognitive capitalism". http://www.generation-online.org/c/fc_rent2.htm (Access: 30 1 2013)
- Wagh, Colin (2010). „Marx and Engels on education”. <http://www.workersliberty.org/story/2010/04/13/marx-and-engels-education> (Access: 30 1 2013)
- Weber, Max (1948). "Science as Vocation". In H. H. Gerth, C. W. Mills eds. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press. 129-156.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. (2006). "Debt Education: Bad for the Young, Bad for America". "Dissent" Vol. 53, No. 3.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. (2008). "Student Debt and The Spirit of Indenture". "Dissent" Vol. 55, No. 4.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. (2009). "The Pedagogy of Debt". In. Edu-factory, *Toward a Global Autonomous University*, New York: Autonomedia.
- Williams, Jeffrey J. (2012). *Deconstructing Academe: The birth of critical university studies*, www.chronicle.com/article/An-Emerging-Field-Deconstructs/130791/ (access: 30 1 2013).
- Wright, Adam (2013). "The school as an arena of political contestation: Towards a post-Marxist account of education". "Praktyka Teoretyczna", 1(7) (*forthcoming*)
- Veblen, Thorstein (1918). *The Higher Learning In America: A Memorandum On the Conduct of Universities By Business Men*, New York: B. W. Huebsch.

Krystian Szadkowski, MA
Institute of Philosophy
Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland
e-mail: szadkowski.k@gmail.com

Papers in the series include the following:

- Vol. 1 (2006) Marek Kwiek, „The Classical German Idea of the University, or on the Nationalization of the Modern Institution”
- Vol. 2 (2006) Marek Kwiek, „The University and the Welfare State in Transition: Changing Public Services in a Wider Context”
- Vol. 3 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Globalisation: Re-Reading its Impact on the Nation-State, the University, and Educational Policies in Europe”
- Vol. 4 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Higher Education and the Nation-State: Global Pressures on Educational Institutions”
- Vol. 5 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „Academic Entrepreneurship vs. Changing Governance and Institutional Management Structures at European Universities”
- Vol. 6 (2007) Dominik Antonowicz, „A Changing Policy Toward the British Public Sector and its Impact on Service Delivery”
- Vol. 7 (2007) Marek Kwiek, „On Accessibility and Equity, Market Forces, and Academic Entrepreneurship: Developments in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe”
- Vol. 8 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „The Two Decades of Privatization in Polish Higher Education: Cost-Sharing, Equity, and Access”
- Vol. 9 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „The Changing Attractiveness of European Higher Education in the Next Decade: Current Developments, Future Challenges, and Major Policy Options”
- Vol. 10 (2008) Piotr W. Juchacz, „On the Post-Schumpeterian "Competitive Managerial Model of Local Democracy" as Perceived by the Elites of Local Government of Wielkopolska”
- Vol. 11 (2008) Marek Kwiek, „Academic Entrepreneurialism and Private Higher Education in Europe”
- Vol. 12 (2008) Dominik Antonowicz, „Polish Higher Education and Global Changes – the Neoinstitutional Perspective”
- Vol. 13 (2009) Marek Kwiek, „Creeping Marketization: Where Polish Public and Private Higher Education Sectors Meet”
- Vol. 14 (2009). Karolina M. Cern, Piotr W. Juchacz, „European (Legal) Culture Reconsidered”
- Vol. 15 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Zarządzanie polskim szkolnictwem wyższym w kontekście transformacji zarządzania w szkolnictwie wyższym w Europie”
- Vol. 16 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Finansowanie szkolnictwa wyższego w Polsce a transformacje finansowania publicznego szkolnictwa wyższego w Europie”
- Vol. 17 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Integracja europejska a europejska integracja szkolnictwa wyższego”
- Vol. 18 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Dynamika prywatne-publiczne w polskim szkolnictwie wyższym w kontekście europejskim”
- Vol. 19 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Transfer dobrych praktyk: Europa i Polska”

- Vol. 20 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „The Public/Private Dynamics in Polish Higher Education. Demand-Absorbing Private Sector Growth and Its Implications”
- Vol. 21 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Universities and Knowledge Production in Central Europe”
- Vol. 22 (2010). Marek Kwiek, „Universities and Their Changing Social and Economic Settings. Dependence as Heavy as Never Before? ”
- Vol. 23 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Universities, Regional Development and Economic Competitiveness: The Polish Case”
- Vol. 24 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Social Perceptions vs. Economic Returns from Higher Education: the Bologna Process and the Bachelor Degree in Poland”
- Vol. 25 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Higher Education Reforms and Their Socio-Economic Contexts: Competing Narratives, Deinstitutionalization, and Reinstitutionalization in University Transformations in Poland”
- Vol. 26 (2011). Karolina M. Cern, Piotr W. Juchacz, „Post-Metaphysically Constructed National and Transnational Public Spheres and Their Content”
- Vol. 27 (2011). Dominik Antonowicz, „External influences and local responses. Changes in Polish higher education 1990-2005”
- Vol. 28 (2011). Marek Kwiek, „Komisja Europejska a uniwersytety: różnicowanie i izomorfizacja systemów edukacyjnych w Europie”
- Vol. 29 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Dokąd zmierzają międzynarodowe badania porównawcze szkolnictwa wyższego?”
- Vol. 30 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Uniwersytet jako ‘wspólnota badaczy’? Polska z europejskiej perspektywy porównawczej i ilościowej”
- Vol. 31 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Uniwersytety i produkcja wiedzy w Europie Środkowej”
- Vol. 32 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Polskie szkolnictwo wyższe a transformacje uniwersytetów w Europie”
- Vol. 33 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Changing Higher Education Policies: From the Deinstitutionalization to the Reinstitutionalization of the Research Mission in Polish Universities”
- Vol. 34 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „European Strategies and Higher Education”
- Vol. 35 (2012). Marek Kwiek, „Atrakcyjny uniwersytet? Rosnące zróżnicowanie oczekiwań interesariuszy wobec instytucji edukacyjnych w Europie”
- Vol. 36 (2013). Krystian Szadkowski, „University’s Third Mission as a Challenge to Marxist Theory”