Manchester Metropolitan University

STEPHANIE DAZA, SHARON SUBREENDUTH, JEONG-EUN RHEE AND MICHELLE PROCTOR

7. FUNDING RE/DE/FORM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Diverse Points of Engagement

INTRODUCTION

In trying to navigate the politics and policy of difference and contemporary school reform, we have experienced how competition for funding has become a policy practice that is re/de/forming higher education. Competition for funding knowledge production is never simply a meritocratic or linear activity but a political process. Policy practice is the dynamic sociocultural and economic histories, experiences and investments of each person, institution, and funding agent in an on-going, interactive process of power re-negotiation, -appropriation, and -creation. This construct is what we label the "politics and policy of difference" in an effort to demonstrate how policy-based funding in higher education results in contradictions between rhetoric and goals of funding re/de/forms and actual policy practice re-negotiated, -appropriated, and -created through embodied lived experience. By using slashes in "re/de/form," we question emerging formations and their meaning; and we call attention to funding shifts in higher education as reform and deform (Arnove, 2005; see also Huckaby, 2014) and also forms of what Daza (2012; 2013a; 2013b) calls "neoliberal scientism." Further defined in the section below, scientism is an anthropocentric, dogmatic worldview that the physical world can be studied and harnessed by (hu)mans for (hu)man benefit and progress. The "hu" in parenthesis also indicates its androcentricism, which is well-captured by Lather's (2004) provocative title, "This is your father's paradigm" (for more on androcentricism, see also Martusewicz, Edmundson, & Lipinacci, 2011).

Rather than approaching the physical planet and social world as relational and interconnected, scientism separates the physical, then conflates and reduces meta/physical and social phenomena to its value-laden version of rational, objective reason. Neoliberalism capitalizes on this skewed version of knowledge production as nonpolitical and non-ideological to support its ability to determine the rules of the academic research game according to a liberal business model in light of global capitalism. While our conceptual discussion of relational onto-epistemology is limited in this chapter, we point readers to Gregory Bateson 1971/2000), Chet Bowers (2011, 2014), Charlene Spretnak (2011), and Alfred Whitehead (1978/2010). As Bateson (1971/2000) writes, "[Onto-]epistemological error is all right, ... up toS. DAZA ET AL. the point at which you create ... a universe in which that error becomes immanent in monstrous changes of the universe that you have created and now try to live in (pp. 490–491).

In this chapter, we share distinct but interconnected "realist tales" (Van Maanen, 1988) about our complicity in the education re/de/form industry. To do this, we draw on our diverse points of engagement with funded projects as both tenured and untenured academics, proposal writers, program evaluators, principle investigators, collaborators, teacher-researchers, and colleagues across different higher education contexts, such as a community college, two teaching institutions, a research extensive university, an aspirational research university in a large university system, and a highly ranked research-driven institute located within a large university. Our analysis also reflects our research and experiences in higher education in multiple US states, as well as Belgium, China, Colombia, Korea, South Africa, and the UK. Although we agree with Erickson (1985), and our external reviewers, that more details about the roles and statuses of the characters and intuitions involved in a narrative might produce different levels of meaning (Erickson 1985), to different degrees we purposely obscure data in this article to deter to some extent connections among characters, roles, and institutions. This move is bifocal (Weis & Fine,

2012; 2013) in that it shifts the focus from our local/micro examples to the global/macro material and discursive conditions of educational re/de/forms. Likewise, although we do not utilize subjectivity as static and write away from such philosophy of consciousness, we do recognize that we actually take up subject-positions and are positioned as subjects in the tales we tell. Thus, we identify here as academic mothers, US citizens, and two of us as immigrant woman, in our 40s, who completed doctorates in education between 2002 and 2006 at The Ohio State University. Even in identifying these subject positions, we also note the fluidity of subjectivity and how we constantly re/negotiate who we are/can be and what we do from different birth, geographic, family, health, religion, political, class, race, ethno-linguistic, and other locations and affiliations. Therefore, taken together, our empirical analyses across diverse settings provide a provocative account of competitive funding re/de/form in contemporary higher education.

We use (post)critical methodologies, such as critical race theory (Rhee, 2013a), postcolonial/decolonizing and social justice frameworks (Subreenduth, 2013; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), and anthropology of policy practice (Shor & Wright, 1997; Levinson, Sutton & Winstead, 2007) to situate our analyses within broader dynamics of power. Knowledge production is as much an effect of historical-material conditions as an innovator of them (De Walt, 2009). As we have written about elsewhere, global capitalism, climate change, and an oligarchy of owning class rule over the global majority of peoples under the guise of democratic nation-states are contemporary effects of long-time oppressive, forced and coerced labor of peoples and enclosure of minds, lands and other resources and spaces under colonial/imperial conditions (Daza & Rhee, 2013; see also, Daza, 2013a, 2013d; Rhee, 2013a; Rhee & Subreenduth, 2006; Subreenduth, 2006, 2013).

FUNDING RE/DE/FORM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education, teacher education, curricula, and educational and social policies are always reproduced though (colonial) local/global power dynamics and often politically mobilized to promote, modify, or resist various agendas (e.g., Proctor & Demerath, 2008). These dynamics are multi-sided complexities that challenge binary views of national de/skilling for workforce development in the name of global competition; language un/training as citizen assimilation; and dis/investments in public education as re/de/forms, for examples. Recognizing the impossibility of

a return to a "pure set of uncontaminated origins" that never existed anyway (Hall, 1996, p. 246-7), the authors of this chapter challenge the basic foundational argument of neoliberal scientism that the best educational reform can happen only through apolitical, meritocratic competition. Every step of the policy process is a social act that depends on how subjects play the politics of difference within an infrastructure that also limits or empowers certain subjects. Therefore, the very idea of neoliberal scientism that the best ideas will win attention and subsequent funding based on

their own merit in an evidenced-based even playing field, and not on historical-material hubris and social capital is inaccurate, and a cultural illusion that often deludes research/ers, funders, and re/de/formers. Relying on post/critical race theory (Rhee, 2013a), we argue that the deconstruction of such sacred myths, which we try to do herein by the pointing out of complicities,

paradoxes, ambiguities, and mis/appropriations of race, gender, and other differences within policy practice, offer new possibilities for change that considers, rather than ignores these dilemmas (Subreenduth & Rhee, 2010). Thus is our aim in sharing our challenges of trying to make ethical-political change and choices in our practice as participants on grants, review committees, proposals, and funded projects.

The chapter is organized into the following sections: a brief introduction to the digital age of neoliberal scientism as the contemporary context of our work as academics in post-secondary institutions; three empirical tales from the field that connect our micro-level practices to macro-level policy-based funding as re/de/form; and a conclusion that draws connections among the tales and offers implications for policy-based funding re/de/form practices.

DIGITAL AGE OF NEOLIBERAL SCIENTISM

Neoliberal scientism is Daza's term for the uneven, albeit worldwide, convergence of material and discursive worlds of business and pre-Kuhnian views of science (Daza, 2012, 2013a, 2013b). Scientism 1 has deep roots. We begin the story in the early 17 th century, when long-established intellectual foundations based on the analysis of ancient Judeo-Christian and Greek philosophical texts were challenged and replaced by the anthropocentric belief that (hu)mans could study, master and use the natural/physical world for (hu)mans' benefit and progress. (Hu)mans (i.e., the Englishman Francis Bacon, the Frenchman Rene Descartes, and the Italian

Galileo Galilei) created a version of science that they proposed was objective, but their ideas of natural, objective, material, and mechanical were value-laden with their own (hu)man subjectivity and hubris. This version of reason and logic was promoted at the expense and of other ways of knowing, replacing religion in the enlightenment and bridling imaginations, and laying the groundwork for positivism and logical positivism in the 19 th and 20 th centuries respectfully. Sadly, the Western idea that humans could harness the physical world through science to save themselves from their own self-destructive tendencies has become a vicious circle, arguably contributing to the climate change crisis and planetary destruction instead (Martusewicz, Edmundson, & Lipinacci, 2011). Although Bacon, Descartes, and Galilei intended to work against the dogmatic religious beliefs of their time, and some scientists rightly continue to work against religious dogma, Sheldrake (2012) shows how scientism itself is a dogmatic faith that closes minds, rather than a science that finds truths (Burnett, 2014) and "comes out" about its own uncertainties (Adams, 2012). Scientism is a worldview that hinders, and can be distinguished

from, a more robust relational science that does not disconnect the mind, brain, and body or the meta/physical and social world (Daza & Gershon, in press; see also Bateson, 1972/2000; Daza & Huckaby, 2014; Whitehead, 1978/2010). Despite the proliferation of science (Lather, 2006), neoliberalism capitalizes on scientism's version of knowledge production as objective and thus, nondogmatic (e.g., "scientific" and/or "evidenced-based") to shape the rules of the academic research game according to a liberal business model in light of global capitalism. It relies on, and is heavily invested in, white, patriarchal, heterosexual, North/West imperialist norms of global capitalism (Hill & Kumar, eds. 2009/2012; Fischman, 2009; Ong, 2006; Lipsitz, 2006; Tuhiwai Smith, 2005; 1999). Yet, neoliberalism builds silently on the structural conditions of historical inequities while disabling the very categories of their recognizability (Rhee, 2013a; Subreenduth 2013a; Subreenduth 2013b). So, the funding re/de/form rhetoric in higher education presents itself as a redeeming narrative that offers ''simply rational-technical solutions'' to complex societal, governmental, educational, and science/research activities and challenges (Fischman, 2009). However, decisions, choices, and opportunities are never neutral nor simply rational-technical. The reregulation and rationalization of private interests and neoliberal value hierarchy has produced a vicious circle of reinvestment in positivist research norms, even in the face of a postpositivist world and decades of critical research (Lather, 2010).

While schooling has always been part of a process of reproducing the contradictions of larger systems (Foley, 1990; Levinson, Foley, & Holland, 1996) neoliberal scientism ''has been very influential ... in defining the educational common sense ... [that] any society that wants to remain competitive needs to implement educational reforms emphasizing the development of a flexible, entrepreneurial teaching workforce ... and a teacher-proof, standards-based and

market-oriented curriculum'' (Fischman, 2009, p. 4). In higher educational settings, the effects of neoliberal scientism, particularly on subject formations, are also evident in the current emphasis on and push for a flexible and entrepreneurial research/er. Spivak (1999)'s analytic move can be instructive here as she examined postcolonial reason

(e.g., "a critique of postcolonial reason") in order to theorize the double-bind of postcolonial subjectivities (for more on the double-bind paradox, see Bateson, 1971/2000). Similarly, it is through STEM Culture 2 (Daza, 2013d) and digital reason (Daza, 2013c; see also Ruthrof, 2005) that neoliberal and digital subjectivities emerge. (See also Rhee, 2013a, for the neoliberal racial project; and Subreenduth, 2013, for a neoliberal social justice.)

Funding awards may have always been valued but until recently academics were not obligated to engage in fund raising. Now, in addition to often increasing teaching, research, and service responsibilities, many academics must fund their own research, salaries, professional travel, and student/service programming by competing for financial support. Despite the rhetoric of policy-based funding that often calls for collaboration (e.g., cross-cultural, interdisciplinary, public-private, institutional partnerships), competitions for funding are happening inside our institutions and beyond. It is worth noting that insidiously nepotistic relationships to external sector funders, such as private philanthropic foundations, industry, and

(quasi) governmental organizations, are not new for higher education institutions. However, it is also worth asking and examining how higher education may now have succumbed to being largely an enterprise of politically laden competitions under a thinly veiled meritocratic guise? Many in this quagmire loath and resist it. Yet, no matter how minuscule the amount of money, students and academics often spend an enormous amount of time and labor preparing funding proposals, in addition to and sometimes in place of, studying, teaching, and researching. In their book in the politics of inquiry by the same name, Baez and Boyles (2009) begin exposing this grant culture. Daza (2013a) further elaborates it as grant-science (see Daza below, this chapter).

As researchers and teachers who find ourselves deeply within these contours, we provide three empirical tales of grant-science. Our diverse engagements with funding re/de/form provide a provocative understanding of the magnitude of change that grant-science is having on higher education. Significantly, it connects micro-level, local practices with macro-level policies and global politics. Together, we examine the agentic challenge for academics in a digital age of neoliberal scientism.

RESEARCH HAPPENS HERE TOO: FUNDING AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE: PROCTOR'S TALE

Like my colleagues at other institutions, higher education at a community college is a complex social and cultural process influenced by many actors and policies, including a powerful neoliberal scientism. In fact, President Obama (State of the Union Address, 2014; State of the Union Address, 2013) lauded community colleges as the vehicle to provide access to higher education for the poor and thus, a way to strengthen the American economy and address social inequity. There are many new neoliberal initiatives that have affected community colleges from the Obama administration such as the American Graduation Initiative of 2009 and the 2011 Round of Grants that demands matching the needs of business with curriculum production and redefining the faculty role in learning (Lewin, 2012; "Obama Reaffirms", 2014; "Obama Awards Nearly", 2011; "American graduation initiative", n.d.). For example, since the economy is struggling, the administration sees community colleges as a tool for retraining students/workers with skills that employers need rather than preparing students for the

traditional mission of either a career OR a transfer academic path. This demonstrates how the emphasis on capitalistic economic needs in neoliberal thinking has, as Lave, Mirowski and

Randalls (2010) argue, commercialized knowledge production in higher education and narrowed the role of faculty and the scope of faculty research. I add the community college perspective to this conversation. I along with an additional colleague consist of the entire elementary, middle and secondary education department. I am the only faculty member who has a doctorate and theoretical training in the foundations of schooling and teacher education. This will prove to be important later in the narrative when discussing responses to policy and neoliberal norms. Reality College is a large, community college that serves a total of 20,000 students just outside one of the largest cities in the Midwestern US and has not been immune to the complexity of neoliberal education reform and its funding norms. In fact, the State of Illinois, for example, has added completion rates at community colleges as criteria for funding. As a result, RC has emphasized the importance of helping students traditionally graduate at each orientation meeting for the last three years. The institution has also implemented organizations like Men of Vision or First Generation programs to help improve retention rates of marginalized students through social programs and visits to four-year institutions. However, this is an example of how the policy objectives are unrealistic and invalid and do not take into account the social and cultural process of policy practice, in the community college contexts. Since community colleges are not typically places where students follow a linear academic or career goal, using graduation rates as criteria for institutional or faculty research is not accurate. Along with this narrowing of thinking and policy practices resulting from neoliberal scientism, competition has redefined the role and culture of community college faculty in the very act of teaching by creating more demands on faculty time that impede our ability to teach for social justice and concurrently, facilitate culturally aware/relevant teacher candidates in my case, as a teacher educator.

Although the mission of community college is to empower its students through open access to education, the ways that knowledge/curriculum is influenced by broader forces (e.g., administration, funding decisions, standardization), and finally implemented, makes the institution a contested space for both faculty and students (Martusewicz, Edmundson, & Lipinacci, 2011). This consequently limits student agency as the curriculum is narrowed and molded by capitalistic economic agendas (internal and external from the state), thus, contradicting the very mission of the institution by enacting education as a sorting tool for society. In addition, just as my colleagues argue below that what constitutes academic labor for tenure and

promotion has shifted under the market forces of neoliberal thinking at their various institutions, the role of a community college faculty member has also evolved under the pressure of grant science. As state funding for higher education and public schools as well continues to be cut, there is more demand from administration to do more with less in the pretense that since faculty don't contractually work a 40-hour week, that increased labor is hardly an unfair demand. This coincides with the traditional view of teaching described by Sadker and Zittleman (2012) as a feminized/service-based profession and therefore, teachers will gladly accept the hegemonic norm that good teachers sacrifice both economically and personally for the sake of their students and school. As this chapter as a whole shows, reform policy builds on this norm of sacrifice when it does not consider non-positivist work or "creative labor" as quantifiable service and thus, important to the act of teaching and learning. In this increasing global and inter-dependent world, helping "at-risk" and/or "marginalized/disadvantaged" students at a community college not only gain access to but also be successful in higher education is more important than ever in order to create global citizens and powerful teacher leaders. However, as part of the new

competition for funding and student enrollment between divisions within the college, faculty are distracted from this mission and expected to give increasing service to the college through participation on committees, some in which decisions about what is research directly impacts faculty research agendas, knowledge production and consequently, student learning.

This narrative aims to enlighten how the review process of faculty grant research in an influential committee at one large, Midwestern community college impacted teaching, college/department/division culture and curriculum. As neoliberalism creates a competitive culture in higher education among faculty for funding, it also influences how faculty at my institution define "real research" and in turn, differently support scholarship that impacts college teaching and student knowledge. I will argue that the decision-making process regarding funding at Reality College (RC), troubled interpersonal and inter-department relationships and that the conflicting views of committee members about what constitutes "real research" shaped knowledge production for students. I also add that each person's educational training and cultural/social positions transmitted certain cultural norms both implicit and explicit in the research evaluation process. However before addressing how power dynamics and committee positionality framed funding, it is important for me to name my own personal and professional locations.

Personal Experience and Policy as a Social Process in Public Schools I became a public school teacher as a member in the National Service Corps, Teach for America in the early 1990s. I started in public education as an elementary French teacher in a small, rural Cajun and Creole community in Southwest Louisiana where I learned firsthand the transformative power of education for students and community. I worked with community members, school administrators, fellow teachers to create several programs that ranged from after-school peer tutoring to the first soccer league in town for elementary to high school age students. Each of these programs taught me how local politics and individual personal beliefs influenced change along each step of the policy process. I had never thought that schools and communities were such complicated and messy cultural places until I became an actual teacher.

From my experiences in Louisiana, I continued to teach in under-serviced public schools for twelve years. However, even as public school teacher, there was an unrealistic and unforgiving discourse on the role of the teacher in the classroom and beyond. At my school in Ohio, I spent 60 percent of my salary on supplies for my students and after-school programs since there was no official district support for supplies and other needs. This ended when several colleagues on the local district union board asked me to stop creating student programs for free since it under-minded their work to create more equitable work environments between administration and teachers. It was an experience in how the disconnect between district policy and public discourse of good teaching impacted real classroom learning. This pushed me to learn more and exercise my agency in a doctoral program from a large Research I institution in the Midwest.

As a white, middle-class woman, my dissertation research explored how teachers

were pushed by the testing policy of No Child Left Behind, what dilemmas of

enacting difference in the classroom emerged from such tensions and what ways

teachers pushed back at the policy constraints. For me, it was a natural sequence as

a teacher/researcher to continue scholarship regarding teacher leadership, policy as

a social process and the cultural processes of schooling as a teacher educator at a

community college. However, some of my own committee members did not support my job choice and told me that it was a waste of my training as a researcher since tenure at a community college was not based on research and publications. I had one mentor who took me aside privately though and said that she was jealous because I would be doing the "real work" of teaching diverse and challenged college students. But she was the minority and her viewpoint was never voiced to the rest of my tenured, full professor committee at this highly regarded Research I institution. This is how I started my career as a community college education professor.

We Don't Do Research Here, but We Do: How Neoliberalism Hurts Social Justice from a CC Perspective

What makes a professor valuable at a community college? What content should be focused on in the beginning of an education program and what theories should frame such teaching and learning for teacher candidates? What research should be supported by the institution? Much of this conversation I believe is impacted by the different ways that community college faculty are trained. What I mean by this is that the academic credentials of faculty at Reality College vary between a masters and a doctoral degree in a specific content area. At RC, of 220 full-time faculty, only

FUNDING RE/DE/FORM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

24 percent have earned doctorates in their fields. In other words, differing academic training impacts how faculty view research, curriculum design and how to measure quality teaching and learning.

Even though the criteria for tenure and promotion at RC does not officially include publications and presentations, it is unofficially implied that scholarship and professional development will be part of a faculty member's teaching process. But this goal is not easy since faculty teach 5 classes a semester, hold ten required office hours each week and give service to the college through committee work. For example, a RC vice-president commented in a meeting that if people wanted to conduct research or be scholars, they should have gone to teach at four-year institutions. However, at the same time, a department chair, who was a highly published psychologist with a doctorate, brought much positive attention to her/his college, division and department. As a result, a dean stated that although scholarship

was not a requirement for tenure, it would "... be great if faculty would be another _____ (insert name of department chair)". The official policy of RC promotes one agenda for tenure while the administration promotes a college culture that transmits competing and thus excessive expectations. It is through navigating such cultural conflict on a college-wide committee that supported faculty development that I experienced the direct impact of neoliberal thinking on funding decisions about faculty research.

The committee was a faculty advisory committee for the college professional development center and included 11 representatives from across the colleges representing the various divisions and career programs. Some members were faculty and some were administrators. Three had doctorates- two in the social sciences and one in law. One committee member was ABD in her doctoral program, also in social sciences. The goal of the monthly meetings was to explore how faculty from our differing content areas viewed professional development and how the center could better support teaching. Most of the support came through in-services offered on campus but did include awarding two faculty research grants once a year.

I served on this committee from various times at RC. It is the semester of Spring 2013 that frames this narrative in particular. The grants supported either individual or collaborative faculty research through the award of class release time. The total number of release hours that could be awarded was six, meaning that one faculty member could have a project that used all of the hours or it could be split between several projects if the committee could not decide on one specific project. The only written guidelines given to committee members was that the research needed to be generalizable, directly impact quality teaching and subsequently student learning and not be work that should be supported by individual deans. What should be supported by individual divisions under their budgets and what should be supported by the financial budget of this committee was not clear in writing and as such, was the topic of much debate every year during this review process. No one seemed to be able to clarify though what projects/research deans should support or what work should be a "normal" expectation of a good faculty member. This is another example of the confusing role of a community college faculty member and how vague policy

guidelines promoted competition, tension and discord in college culture.

While I do believe that my colleagues all wanted to improve teacher quality and student learning as evident in our discussions throughout the years around professional development, the idea of what actually constitutes valuable research was not a shared value and caused much debate each year in the research evaluation meetings. The lack of understanding of what was research was also evident in the low numbers of proposals reviewed each year. For example, there were no more than five proposals to evaluate for the award each year that I served on the committee.

When asked why the number was consistently low, the chair commented that the large number of classes faculty taught made the application process a soft priority and that what work could be labeled as research seemed vague and misunderstood across the college. She charged us to help her better define what was useful research for other faculty. My positionality as a teacher/teacher educator /educational researcher frames research in the context of qualitative over quantitative criteria. Other members argued though that quality research needed to be relevant to the entire faculty (but did not name this as generalizability) in order to be worthy of our support and considered "real research". When I argued that a thick description that helped one faculty member see his or her pedagogy and classroom climate in a new light would be positive for many students and thus, a case study for all to learn from, I met with much opposition from the team. The positivist view of research was alive and strong at the community college. I was told that case studies and non-generalizable research were not scholarship. In fact, there was no debate about the contributions of case studies or collective case studies but only a discussion about surveys and hard numbers.

The administrators on the committee wanted the supported research to translate into future professional presentations and scalable features, while the Science representative wanted research to be sample-driven and replicable, and to support the "hard" sciences. For example, when the college made an organized policy push towards becoming more "eco-friendly" and sustainable, the grant was awarded to the project that studied local life-cycles of butterflies, created a butterfly garden on campus and taught an in-service about it. Another awarded project surveyed faculty

teaching online classes in an attempt to create a standardized template for quality online teaching. I did not vote for that project.

In the Spring 2013 process, the competition of neoliberal thinking around research funding (and the projects under review) also impacted professional relationships in my own department and between others when my department chair applied for a grant. When I noted that there could be a question of ethical conflict since she was my department chair, I was told that my doctoral training in research was more valuable and that I was needed and could not leave. It is important to note that my philosophies of good teaching and learning have also been the source of much tension between myself and the department chair so I personally was hoping that she would get the funding so I could avoid another work conflict. As I geared up for another debate on what is real research and how that relates to good teaching for our students, the committee chair decided that since this project had not used the correct application, it would not even be discussed. We voted on three others and I breathed a premature sigh of relief.

Shortly afterward, my dean shared his anger on the rejection of the project by the committee and how it was an example of inefficient bureaucracy. I interjected that I thought it was more of an issue of different academic training and competing views on scholarship rather than a power play against our division. He did not know until that point that I served on the evaluation committee and I left the meeting reminding myself that I never wanted to be in administration and deal with politics in academia at that level. I was also unsure of how my committee membership would impact my professional relationship with my leadership since from that perspective, it seems I had not been loyal to my division. This raises broader questions about how proposals become projects: who votes for whom and why?

Two days later and a week past the committee decision, I sat in my first department meeting with the chair whose project was rejected, which she mentioned. I quickly realized that like my dean, she was not aware of my role in the committee. I commented that I wanted to be upfront and honest with the goal that it would not affect our working relationship. I said that serving on the committee was interesting because we all came from different divisions across the college and had varying

views of research and policy. She moved on to other issues and I thought the tension was concluded. I was wrong.

Instead, she wrote an email to the committee chair stating that she did not want me to know of the email but that I had told her that her project was rejected due to a misunderstanding on what constituted "real research". She continued to argue for an appeal citing that our "Yale trained doctorate holding dean" had signed off on her project's merits along with a scientist from a nearby medical company (her husband) and thus, her project was deserving of funding. I was confronted by this email minutes before the next committee meeting by the committee chair in order for her to have a context for her response to my department chair, whose project was still denied funding. As a result, I confronted my department chair about the ethics of her email and manipulation of our conversation to advance her own work. She later apologized but as a result, any trust I had in our relationship was lost. I learned I could not have an honest and forthcoming conversation with her about the politics of funded research. The policy process of funding grants was a political mess that re-framed inter-department relationship and interpersonal relationship between myself and others in the college. I realized that I had little agency on this committee and within my own small department and that neoliberal scientism was well entrenched in my college culture. I withdrew from the committee partially due to this tension but went on to experience similar tensions when another opportunity presented itself to help create policy on professional development around issues of diversity for faculty.

As noted in this narrative, funding policies and practices at RC demonstrate how policy is a social and cultural process but how neoliberal scientism does not even recognize this relationship at all in the context of what is "real" research. In the latter framework, all learning, teaching, research is apolitical and never personal. It is, as argued by Giroux (2012), a reform/policy discourse driven by market forces and threatening the basic democratic nature of schooling. Like other institutions of higher education explored in this chapter, the educational policies of funding at a community college are just the beginning of a much deeper conflict over the purpose of education for all and not just the privileged few.

THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF FUNDING FOR/AS KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTION:

A CASE ON UNFUNDED PROJECTS: SUBREENDUTH & RHEE'S TALE

Kevin K. Kumashiro (2012), in

Bad Teacher! How Blaming Teachers Distorts the

Bigger Picture

, illuminates how the logics of United States (US) neoliberal education

reform have generated a conceptual shift that frames education as competition. In

order to reveal issues of unequal power relations in this shift, he engages with three

analytic questions: (1) who is winning and who is losing in this competition?; (2)

who made the rules?; and (3) what is the story that we tell the losers to get them to

want to continue playing? (pp. 3–5). We find his approach instructive for our own

analysis on grant science, which is unavoidably structured as competition. We thus

present the questions as a backdrop to our narrative of collaboratively working on

(unfunded) grant projects. While we may not directly utilize the questions to tease

out every element of our experience, we want readers to engage with our narrative

along with them.

We set the primal scene of our narrative as the first time our grant proposal was

recommended for, but subsequently denied, funding:

On our phone feedback session with the funding branch officer, we were strongly

encouraged to re-apply for the women's leadership institute grant project. We

had proposed a program, entitled "Empowering women's leadership: working

toward global solutions by bridging time and diverse worlds," that would

take place in two different universities across two different regions. This was

possible because of our unique long-term partnership with each other and

we anticipated that this would be received as an innovative approach by the

grant funding agency. While we did not receive funding for this project, we

were informed that reviewers evaluated our proposal as "very competitive and

outstanding" and unanimously approved our proposal for funding.

After this conversation, and having been encouraged to re-apply for the next funding

cycle, we were optimistic about our competitiveness in the next round. For us, the

unanimous reviewer recommendation of our proposal signaled their recognition on

the integrity of our proposal and the labor and knowledge construction invested in

the project. With such complimentary feedback we bought into the mentality that losing the competition now seemed to be the stepping stone to winning later. We were so motivated by this feedback that we were emboldened to plan as if we would be funded the following year. So we enthusiastically sent out this e-mail (excerpted) to our collaborators in each of our universities:

Dear Women's Leadership Grant Proposal Collaborators

I have several updates on our grant proposal. Finally we received a formal letter on May 7 (see the attached). I still have no idea of why/how a letter stamped on March 13 was delivered to us on May 7 ...

On Tuesday (May 15), we were able to get in touch with the Branch Officer to receive reviewers' feedback on our proposal. An ironically wonderful news is that our proposal was one of the finalists!!

Reviewers evaluated our proposal as "very competitive and outstanding" and approved it for funding. Yes, they unanimously approved our proposal for funding!! However, since only one project in each region can be funded, the agency had to rank the finalists and we did not get the funding. S College and another university (which cannot be revealed at this point as they are still in the process of contract) are awarded the funding. Both of them are women's colleges ... Exciting news is that there will be another similar call for proposals this fall. We were strongly encouraged to reapply. Since it was recommended not to change anything in our proposal but to highlight the strengths of our approaches (e.g., having two institutions as host campuses etc.), our second attempt should be a little easier ...

So please expect to hear from me sometime early this fall again!! We'll pursue this project together. This could not have been possible without all of your contributions and commitments to this project. So Thank you, everyone.

At the outset we knew that our organizational, logistics and theoretical approach for the project was very different from traditional grant applications. We developed the proposal to take place physically and virtually in both of our higher education institutions (Midwest and a suburb area of New York City) and conceptualized women's leadership beyond Eurocentric and neoliberal models, diversified US

women history, and emphasized embodied leadership development. Therefore, the positive feedback we received was both encouraging and legitimating of our different and critical approach. However when we applied the following year, our project was again recognized as "very competitive and outstanding" and not selected for funding.

The above context frames our discussion on neoliberal logics of competition and ranking for educational and academic work and the political economy of dominant and critical knowledge production and (dis)circulation. Additionally, we examine the implications of the nature and value of grant work/labor when proposals are not selected for funding and thus marked as unsuccessful (losers). More specifically, our collaborative work on two unfunded projects on women leadership serves as the nexus to interrogate the unspoken and invisible process of grant funding structure and culture with regards to program requests for integrating diversity, women leadership and US history focus for international participants from developing countries.

When the original call for proposals (CFP) for developing an academic and cultural institute on women's leadership for international undergraduate students from Africa and Middle East was posted, we saw this CFP as an opportunity for us to work with women of color from marginalized, developing and post-colonial geographies. Additionally, our current positions and workloads in our institutions does not allow for us to develop and teach such academic sessions as this project required, so it was a way to nourish our own post-colonial biographies. Working collaboratively to develop a proposal for this grant was also based on our desire to share what we built together for our own leadership as transnational women of color in US academia (Subreenduth & Rhee, 2010). Drawing from our long term partnerships that nurtured our personal and professional growth, connections, and leadership, we wanted to develop an academic, cultural, community-based mentoring program that would support and inspire both personal and professional growth of these post-colonial generation women from Africa and the Middle East.

The CFP required the following element:

The institution should aim to provide undergraduate women leaders an introduction to women's leadership in the United States

, while strengthening

their leadership skills and heightening their awareness of US and global women's issues

. The Institutes should examine the history and evolution of US society, culture, values, and institutions , with particular emphasis on women's roles throughout US history. The Institutes should also incorporate a focus on contemporary American life and contemporary women

, including the role of women in political, social, and economic issues and debates. The Institutes should address the   influence of principles and values such as democracy,

the rule of law, individual rights, freedom of expression, equality, diversity, and tolerance on the empowerment of women in the United States. (emphasis added)

 We were enthused by the direct request for addressing the principles of "equality,

diversity, and tolerance on the empowerment of women in the United States" and

sought to integrate into our programming the representative and complex diversity

of US women, women leadership models and conceptualizations of women and

leadership in the United States. As transnational woman educators of color who

ground our work in a decolonizing theoretical and political framework (Daza,

2013e; "Decolonizing Local/Global Formations," 2013; Subreenduth, 2008; Rhee &

Subreenduth, 2006), our approach for this project was to critically examine dominant

(Eurocentric) leadership models and offer diasporic, transnational, and racial/

cultural feminist perspectives in the US. We believed that this critical approach that

integrated the complex diversity of women leadership in the US would provide an

opportunity for these non-western international women to identify leadership models

embedded in their own embodied relationships within their contexts and utilize

them to transform the actual conditions of their and others' lives. Invoking Aida

Hurtado (2003)'s "Theory in the Flesh: Toward an Endarkened Epistepmology," we

were working from interconnected scholarships of women of color, Third World

feminists, and decolonizing projects (Anzaldua, 1987; Erevelles, 2011; Mohanty,

Russo, & Torres, 1991; Mutua & Swadener, 2004). We wanted to offer these women

an opportunity to reflect on and recognize the validity of their own epistemology in

creating and sustaining leadership models and initiatives grounded in their embodied

relationships. This was the political knowledge economy that we were working from

while still remaining within the requirements and criteria of the project.

Putting the framework to practice, we examined the strengths and weaknesses of

developing an educational program for international audience across two different

universities and came to the conclusion that this model could provide unique benefits for all our participants—not only target international women students but also other faculty, staff, students, and community organizers within and outside our universities who would participate in this project. However, the CFP expected one institution, one project, one project director, one budget, one syllabus, etc. A two-institution collaboration was not the mainstream expectation for this kind of grant; so, we checked with the grant agency if collaboration across two institutions might be a mark against our proposal. We explained our plan for integrating the virtual and physical components of our programming, as well as how we saw Midwestern and New York geographies as expanding the international women's understanding of diversity and that it allow us to offer access to diverse entities in both locations. We were informed that while they had not seen or funded such an approach in the past, and while they cannot as "part of the Q&A with prospective applicants," sanction any such organizational/programming per se (as all proposals are sent to reviewers and decisions (apparently) are not determined by the funding agency) they would encourage us to develop this new approach. This openness and flexibility of the programming officer led us to believe that the game was fair, that we could still win, and therefore working for this grant competition was something that we wanted to do (Kumashiro, 2012, p. 4).

 The encouragement was sufficient for us to move forward. The fact that they did not discourage us from pursuing this grant utilizing two hosting universities and a non-traditional framework was an initial indication to us that the agency was open to alternative models of collaboration and programming. What we now recognize in hindsight is how neoliberal guises of openness and flexibility (like the phone conversation and the CFP focus described above) successfully seduced us to be willing to be a part of game/competition in contrast to explicit discriminatory differentiations through colonial value hierarchy (Daza, 2013b; Rhee 2009, 2013). Once this was cleared up, we had worked to reach out to various faculty members within our institutions and across the country as speakers or instructors as well as local community organizers and activists whose work focused on women leadership. We were deliberate in our outreach–we wanted to capture the diversity of women

leadership within the US and so tapped into individuals and organizations who could offer this. We made sure that our project instructors and staff (including students) represented as much diversity not only in their embodied identities and affiliations but also in their epistemological and theoretical approaches. Simultaneously, we kept in mind the young women who would be participating in the project and how these sessions needed to offer opportunities for reflection and examination of their own leadership potential and development.

Our careful attention was put on how to challenge an already westernized and colonized discursive category of women as a monolithic, essentialized homogenous group both within the US and within the home countries of the participants (Mohanty, Russo, & Torres, 1991; Mohanty, 2004). We wanted to convey how immensely, conflictual and diverse the material and historical conditions of life have constituted women so differently (even within the US) that any universal approach to women leadership can un/intentionally perpetuate western/US imperialistic epistemologies (Rhee, 2006). For example, in discussing evolutions of women's roles in US society, in addition to second wave feminism, we included women of color feminism, Native American and First Nation and indigenous women. This introduced intersectional analysis that does not exclude other social differences such as race, class, sexuality, religion and borderland analysis that considers the geopolitical material power and capitalistic globalization (Anzaldua, 1987). The same critical approaches were applied to every required element such as history, progress, democracy, contemporary life, and even diversity and embedded throughout the academic sessions so that attention to diversity in leadership meant paradigm shifts in theories of leadership that will explore how dimensions of diversity shape our understanding of leadership. By paying attention to the perceptions and expectations of diverse leaders by diverse followers, our program also included examinations on how the exercise of leadership is very contextual. For leaders to be relevant for the 21st century amidst new social contexts, emerging global concerns, and changing population demographics, we envisioned that they must attend to these complexities (Chin, 2007).

Not totally naïve to the politics of funding and knowledge production status quo, we discussed that our approach of programming could be read as too radical

or too critical for the grant agency. Strategizing our move through Daza's (2012) complicity as infiltration for doing grant work in the age of neoliberal scientism, we decided to use a mainstream textbook, Kellerman and Rhode (2007)'s Women

and Leadership: The State of Play and Strategies for Change as a way to align our project with the language of the call for program requests but offer workshops that focused on alternative models of women leadership. This was our transgressive political move and complicity with the status quo or necessary abiding by the rule of competitions—but as part of programming, this also would offer our participants an opportunity to engage with mainstream women leadership models.

In sharing parts of our institute focus here we are presenting our own academic and political investments in women leadership and (grant funded) knowledge generation. We utilized what we still believe on part of the funding agency to be flexible and fair language in CFP as it allowed us to interpret the expectations for our institute through an alternative programming and women leadership framework. Consequently, we interpreted the aforementioned feedback from the grant agency after our first submission as an approval on the merits of our work and tried to use it as a way to improve any weakness. When the CFP was released the following year, we "chose" to pursue it again. While we had a blueprint for writing our application, it took another round of intense preparations, discussion, networking, budgeting, and writing as anyone who have done "re-applying" would know. Working on the second call for funding was way more time consuming than we anticipated. For example, the simple logistics of re-gathering support letters and updating participants as instructors and speakers required a lot of back and forth communications as some were no longer available, and revising the narrative including the budget elements was tedious. So our original note to our collaborators that the next round would be easier proved to be naïve.

Despite this intensive labor and time spent, we were still motivated by the possibility of enacting this diverse grant model of women leadership as a way to intervene in the homogenous renderings of women leadership within the US and abroad. It was also our own epistemic/political desire to interact with these women

from marginalized regions and allow us to develop deeper understanding of women leadership with them as individuals within specific locales, geographies and politics. Our own universities are unable to offer such engagement so we sought such grant funding as a way to address our own personal and scholarship investment in women leadership.

 After the intense several weeks of putting the second proposal together, we submitted our application and almost five months later with several inquiries on a decision, we were informed that we were not selected for funding but was highly competitive again. At that point, both of us felt completely drained emotionally and intellectually, disappointed, and burnt out. This time, we did not follow up although we now think we should have. The letter we received was very basic and non-committal with no details or suggestions. However it did encourage us to call and set up a phone conversation (as we had done for our first application). Maybe we were too tired as the letter came towards the end of the semester, maybe it was another lynchpin of neoliberal higher education competitions that we knew too well —which always have to have a winner and losers. Maybe it was too frustrating to re-hear how well our grant was articulated but no one is ready to bet on its success at this time because it has not being tried before (need for scientific proof!), maybe we simply recognized the futility of our labor to follow up and be encouraged. Whatever the maybe could have been, we did not follow-up. We gave up on wanting to hear the non-committal feedback, the encouragement, the try again for the next round of funding. Perhaps this was another reminiscent moment of how we have been often told that diversity, creative approaches, interdisciplinary frameworks, and collaborative efforts matter while they were rarely legitimized and validated by institutional recognitions in our academic careers (Brayboy, 2003).

 As part of the writing of this chapter, we started to re-discuss our collaboration and experiences. Discussion became analysis as we started to piece together our conversations with our collaborators and the funding agency. Even after the two this is common practice but why is it not explained in the CFP? We also learned that funding went to two small liberal arts women's colleges. Where in the CFP did it state that women only colleges would get preference? Is it the coincidence that the

two women leadership projects to get funded are women's colleges? Irrespective of the merit of their and our proposals, what assumptions and implications for such funding for those of us not in women only colleges yet committed to women's issues? Harkening to Kumashiro's question of who made the rules, we extend by asking how did the rules get re-made in the process of review, evaluation, ranking and funding?

During this first follow-up session, we were informed that the first round of application was more of a pilot and a continuation of previous grant initiatives with older women leadership. The second application process would be more open to various institutions and would also offer more funded projects. Our conversation ended with the officer adding that the only "minor" addition we probably need to make is to articulate further how using two institutional settings can be effectively managed. That we knew we could further clarify for the next application. While we cannot corroborate who was funded for the second round we did find at least two (out of the four projects to be funded) community colleges who seem to advertise that they are recipients of the women leadership grant. We think that this is a positive direction in grant funding as community colleges have been marginalized as potential sites of scholarship and faculty grant funding. We commend this as a political move on part of the funding agency to assert the value of community colleges and for us personally and professionally an intervention in the higher education monopoly on grant funding.

However, the invisibility of these criteria or expectations in CFP alludes to the omnipresent political agenda that irrespective of merit and innovation certain grant proposals will remain unfunded and will become the reason for funded grants—the winners. Had we known that each round of application has a preference for a specific type of higher education institution such as women's college or community college, we are pretty sure we would not have worked to stay in the competition. As much as free market based neoliberalism is always political and involves the state governing selectively to benefit certain segments of society (Olssen & Peters, 2005), we argue that there are always such hidden political components in grant competition as well.

So, how will our story be marked in political economy of grant work? Will it be the whining and complaining of losers? As much as that banal designation of "an

equal opportunity, affirmative action employer" in US higher education institutions does not mean much in actually bringing equality and equity to hiring, retaining and promoting practices, universal calls, raving reviews, and encouragements to reapply may not mean much in grant competitions. They may simply be the story to be told for losers to continue the neoliberal path to become a winner or to legitimize the value of competition. When all these proposals do not get funded, do we need to see ourselves as losers? What outlets become accessible for this kind of unfunded grant work that are marked as outstanding but unfundable? With the significant change in culture of higher education and grant writing where universities emphasize performativity, measurable outcomes, and academic audits, how would our labor exerted for unfunded projects be recognized—scholarship, service, or something else? What contributions can this type of labor make to the production and circulation of knowledge?

Another debilitating consideration for us is our inability to carry forward our collaborative plans because of lack of funding. The collaborations with scholars and community activists remain passively typed onto our proposal pages through the language that evokes passion and commitment. Lost potential for powerful collaborations between higher education and community entities remain. While such grant collaborations opened up conversational possibilities for shared commitments, the labor and trust that our collaborators invested in the project remain invisible and disposable to the funding agencies and our universities but weigh heavily on us. Particularly under the current economic conditions, most higher education institutions are not able to provide seed money to enact such unfunded projects. The grant agency is not interested in following up with unfunded proposals even with excellent reviews. What does it mean to labor in this way in higher education, for grant writing, for knowledge production and circulation? What does it mean for academics like us who want to do the grant work for the political desire?

Despite the lack of clarity, our ambiguous stance to grant writing/funding, we circle back to whether there is any value in continued work on and submitting proposals that challenge Eurocentric modes of epistemology, models of leadership and diversity knowing that we stand a great chance of not being funded. Despite

our questions and narrative that allude to the futility of certain types of grant work, we frame our unfunded projects as a step toward transformational resistance (Rhee, 2013b; Shahjahan, 2012) to grant work as competition. We also invite readers to use our narrative on unfunded projects as a way to generate questions and discussions about what alternative frames may be possible in engaging with grant work. Rather than pursuing a story that may "fix" us/losers to be successful winners of the funding race, we now labor to explore how we can do continuous expansion of decolonizing work against, through, and within the aspects of funding for knowledge production, however messy, complicit, and laborious it is (Daza, 2012; Rhee, 2013b).

AMBIGUITY OF GRANT-SCIENCE LABOR: DAZA'S TALE

Beginning my doctoral studies in 2000, I have almost 15 years of post-graduate experience in four types of institutions. The institutions are in different geographical and higher education contexts, including a flagship Research I land-grant university; an aspiring research institution in a large state university system; a prestigious, highly-ranked research institution in the UK; and a public university known for teaching that prepares more educational professionals than any other US institution. Regardless of the context or my academic position, I have spent a significant portion of my time preparing proposals for internal and external funding, and this seems ever increasing. Under the guidance of Patti Lather, Peter Demerath, and Abril Trigo, my doctoral program in Cultural Studies and Social and Cultural Foundations of Education in the School of Policy and Leadership at Ohio State University trained me well to conduct research, teach face-to-face, and provide public and professional service. Through my dissertation that studied globalizing trends in higher education (Daza, 2006a; 2006b), I also developed a global-local understanding of academic work. However, the higher education context I was prepared for practically no longer exists. Currently, academic labor in higher education is interpolated through this "history of the vanishing present" (Spivak, 1999a) and into a new regime of grant-science.

Much of what I have learned and utilized in my academic work, including an aesthetically trained imaginary for onto- epistemological performance, and especially grant-writing skills, however, has not come from academic study, theory,

philosophers, or textbooks alone. Prior to entering graduate school, I served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in Bolivia, where I also spent a significant amount of time preparing funding proposals and working across various boundaries with governmental and non-governmental agencies, the Bolivian military, and teams of people on projects. While I had already learned how power dynamics and local/global politics come out to play as a subject of difference (Daza, 2008, 2009) and a public school teacher in California during proposition 187 (see Daza, 2006a), my experiences in Bolivia made the politics of policy-based funded work clearer. Thinking with/through these experiences has shaped my take on policy-based funded research in the digital age of neoliberal scientism as grant-science.

Grant-science is changing the nature of research and academic labor, as I have written about elsewhere (Daza, 2012, 2013). For US readers, by "academic labor," I mean academic faculty labor; for UK and other readers, I am referring to academic staff labor. According to Fitzgerald, Gunter, White, & Tight (2012), some 800 years of university history has dramatically changed since the late 1970s and 1980s:

... in a relatively short period of time, academic work and academic identity has shifted from being largely autonomous, self-governing with particular privileges and public duties, to a profession that has been modernized, rationalized, reorganized and intensely criticised.... academics have been repositioned as managed professionals within a managed university.... the managerial environment and subsequent managerial demands are seductive as 'they lay ground for new kinds of success and recognition'. (p. 2)

US-centric readers also may be surprised to learn that other higher education systems already do not have tenure. The UK abolished tenure in 1988. Grant-science challenges the tenability of tenure. In higher education systems without tenure, academics still have pathways to promotion and long-term, continuous contracts, which separate semi-permanent staff from flexible workers on short-term contracts, but which do not offer the same kind of preservation of autonomy or long-term job security as tenure. At the same time, other countries provide a basic safety net to the entire population (e.g., the UK National Health Service), whereas the lack of similar rights to social services like healthcare in the US makes flexible,

temporary academic labor more arduous and egregious. In Germany, for a different case, academics may acquire civil servant status, and consequently attending rights and benefits, but the process is different from tenure-track (in US) and tenure-stream (in Canada) processes (http://www.eui.eu/ProgrammesAndFellowships/ AcademicCareersObservatory/AcademicCareersbyCountry/Index.aspx).

While the professional aspirations of individuals for both career advancement and sheer survival in a cut-throat competitive, global environment, certainly have contributed to the hegemony of an era of neoliberal scientism in higher education, this chapter shows that it is not always clear what counts as success, failure, or resistance. While higher education may have been (or may have appeared) relatively stable, compared to K-12 education, uncertainty of never static regimes means rules are continuously in flux. While such ambiguity is not necessarily fair, equitable, or predicable, it does open the possibility that something different could happen, and indeed is always already happening.

Beyond surviving, the challenge for academic labor is reimagining agency in grant-science and playing a role in shaping futures—new knowledges, knowledge producers, and a new kind of higher education for an un/imaginable future. As I have written about elsewhere (Daza, 2006, 2012), there is no noncomplicitous academic position; the power of the center to regulate the margins complicates resistance formations. Value neutral education is a myth (Kumashiro, 2008). Neither higher education nor academics have ever been apolitical. At its worst, higher education is a training ground for oppression under the guise of middle-class sensibilities that depends on maintaining discursive and material inequities of class, whiteness, heterosexuality, androcentrism, anthropocentrism, and so on, where resistance often results in ineffective identitarian politics (See de Oliveira Andreotti, 2014). As Shahjahan (2012) also argues, neoliberal logics colonized higher education.

I wonder whether or not (and how) higher education might exist in the future and how to shape the complicity of academic labor, including my own, as infiltration (Daza, 2012). But how do we re/de/un/train the imagination for epistemological performance? What might training for an unfixed mind be? Although she is not optimistic, Spivak (2012) offers aesthetic education as an approach. Despite higher

education's faults, prejudices, and limitations, I publically wonder if ambiguities in higher education still offer some space and time for such aesthetic forms of knowledge production, for a more socially and ecologically just world, for research methodology and theories as practices of abstraction to help translate, synthesize and analyze local, personal, and physical world phenomena within broader power dynamics and macro-level policies and politics towards new forms of being, knowing, doing, and living.

As a neoliberal, digital subject-agent, a product of STEM Culture, and knowledge worker complicit in neoliberal scientism, I have moved my own work from investigation, resistance, and critique to trying to make and do new/ different aesthetic approaches to knowledge production. For example, I am trying to create digital-acoustic data analysis where data might be experienced both digitally and as a live performance installation, rather than summarized in a policy brief. Because this mode of knowledge production shares complicity with STEM Culture and digital reason, I am hopeful about funding it, but also see its aesthetic sense-embodiments as infiltration into STEM Culture and digital reason. Space prevents a more expansive discussion of aesthetic interventions into (digital) enclosures (Bateson, 1972/2000), but suffice it to say that these approaches worry less about standardization, understanding, repetition, certainty, interpretation, and comprehensibility; they might be more art than science or considered more science fiction than social science, although such divisions break down in ambiguities.

My contribution to this chapter looks particularly at the ambiguity of academic labor in grant-science. First, I provide a conceptual backdrop to academic labor in the digital age of neoliberal scientism. Then, I describe and analyze multiple examples of grant-science practice. Finally, I discuss the implications of ambiguity in grant-science labor.

Conceptualizing Academic Labor

Arguably, academic labor has always been ambiguous and stratified across and within institutions, such as by gender, rank, discipline, salary, type of institution, location, etc. Perceptions, policies, and actual practices of academic labor often fail to capture the hidden intellectual and emotional labor involved in knowledge

production, especially for female scholars of color (Brayboy, 2003; Rhee, 2013b). Although teaching and service labor are also knowledge production, how academic labor is conflated and divided, as scholarship, service and teaching, may offer insight into how academic labor is being re/de/formed in the digital age of neoliberal scientism as grant-science.

A myopic focus on teaching as content delivery and/or a display of knowledge content (in policy and often in practice) re/de/forms knowledge production. Although contested, this logic of replicability and generalizability is reflected in the proliferation of standardization and online content delivery systems to mass audiences (Daza, 2013a). Moreover, academic labor today includes email, blogging, various forms of social media (twitter, facebook, etc.), heightened image management, and increased participation in digital surveillance of labor through online research information management systems (e.g., http://www.symplectic. co.uk/, Google scholar, etc.) designed to track academic labor. Monitoring systems are not innocent or objective. Designed to audit academic labor, they re/de/form labor to what can be counted (e.g., courses taught, citations, funding amounts), and ignore aesthetics, bodies, affect, minds, and nuance. The turn-and-burn, fast food method of the re/de/form industry reproduces certain knowledges, and it also re/de/ forms academic labor for its purpose.

From early childhood to graduate school, educators have always spent enormous amounts of time and energy doing hidden labor: collecting data (whether formally or informally, educators are always collecting information, analyzing it, and making decisions.); reading; thinking; analyzing; synthesizing; preparing courses and materials; monitoring, mentoring and caring for students; marking/grading work; attending activities; writing reports; and providing service to facilitate institutions. Academics of color have an additional burden to diversify institutions (Brayboy, 2003; Subreenduth, 2008). As Proctor's narrative in this chapter shows, all scholars who advocate beyond institutional norms may also experience additional, often emotionally stressful, labor.

Creative labor may also be overlooked as activities unrecognized as intellectual work (e.g., Labor is perceived as toil not joy.). For example, daydreaming, yoga,

traveling, listening/playing music, and other such activities produce, and may creatively enhance, knowledge production, but might be dismissed as play, instead of intellectual labor (see Daza & Huckaby, 2014). Also, even when some activities, such as reading email or journal articles, and even writing funding proposals, are recognized as intellectual labor, the amount of time needed to do these activities may be grossly under-estimated.

A digital efficiency model of neoliberal scientism holds academics, and all institutions, workers, and students, accountable to do more of certain kinds of labor (often with fewer resources). The model is seductive in its ability to map on to middle-class sensibilities (e.g., meritocracy) of higher education research/ers. It offers rewards to some but also blames the victims of deficient conditions and inefficient structures when they do not succeed. Or their labor cannot be digitally tracked. So, what about all the labor academics do that is not digitally captured? What about all the new hegemonic accounting labor academics already do in (self) monitoring and reporting? (i.e., How can we track the labor we spend reporting our labor?) What about the labor of social justice and diversifying institutions, or the labor of thinking? Arguably, academic labor has never been a free-for-all (or fair and meritorious) but until recently academics had more say in determining what counts. Although not completely unambiguous, new and early career faculty could usually count on the academic capital of peer-reviewed publications, teaching face-to-face courses, and being a "good" citizen via service to department, university, community and the profession.

In contrast, grant-science demands that labor be measurable. Labor is often recorded in percentages of time or salary as "work effort." A researcher might include one day per week for a year at their current salary rate to reflect their effort on a grant project. Of course, there is little provision for the amount of time it takes to write a successful funding proposal or the real costs of grant-science. Funding re/ de/form of academic work also fails to understand that for many academics being an academic is a life not a job. AAUPs 1994 report states that academics work on average 45-52 hours per week. Just twenty years later, academics may be working closer to 61 hours per week (Ziker et al., 2014).

It is important to note that this kind of calculating of "work effort," as hours per week, reflects how the "complicity of Eurocentric and linear notions of time in the colonial project finds its corollary in contemporary neoliberal logics in HE [higher education]" (Shahjahan, 2014). Indeed, being an academic is not a 9-5-Monday-Friday-gig; academics work nights, weekends, and holidays. For those of us who have finished PhDs in the 21st century, Shahjahan prompts us to examine this aspect of our own neoliberal subjectivity. Alas, being unproductive, or lazy (Shahjahan, 2014) may be an intervention, despite various consequences.

Albeit exceptions, senior colleagues, who might be in a position to mitigate grant-science, often seem shocked at the new labor expected of emerging scholars, but powerless or paralyzed to do anything about it. Was there really a time when academics had ample time to read books, discuss ideas, and meet with students or is this a romantic academic fantasy? It is a mistake, however, to not understand preparing funding proposals as an intellectual exercise itself, a welcome difference between UK and US at least in my experience, but for how long? I wonder what senior scholars and administrators, who make decisions about promotion, and tenure in the US, use indirects (grant monies) of our labor to fund other projects, and sit on funding evaluation committees, make of the academic labor of grant-science? Grant-science labor may be a choice for academics in permanent and tenured positions, but it is obligatory (at least de facto) for most new and emerging scholars who want a shot at an academic (research) career in higher education. Indeed, junior scholars may find themselves in the awkward position of being asked to train senior academics and teaching/practitioners how to write grants, or asked to do this labor for academic units, which can be met with various responses, some unwelcome.

Tellingly, grant writing and external funding was not even featured in the 1994 AAUP report on faculty work. While there is a long history of externally funded academic research, the increase in higher education costs coupled with the decrease in State/federal funds has created a situation where academics are forced to fund their own salaries, studentships/fellowships, laboratory costs, and so on (AAUP, 1994). The effects/affects of these changes are playing out and to come (Daza, 2012, 2013a, 2013b; Shahjahan, 2014; see also the other chapters in this edited volume).

At best, an enormous amount of ambiguity surrounds what, and how, grant activity, is valued, or not. Below I analyze paraphrases that show the ambiguity of grant-science labor and also shed light on politics, policies, and practices of grant-science in higher education. The double-bind of ambiguity is the possibility that something will happen but no guarantees about what it will be. Ambiguity is not necessarily nice or fair; it is unfixed.

Logics of Grant-Science in Practice: Ambiguity Matters

I have applied for numerous internal and external grants of varying amounts and durations and I have been awarded various internal and external grants. I also served as a co-principal investigator (co-PI of nearly a million US dollars on two large multi-year grants from a major US federal funding source). The following are paraphrases that capture the spirit of some of the comments I have received from administrators, senior academics, peer and early-career academics, and administrative support staff in grants and contracts offices. Data illustrate the ambiguity of grant-science on multiple levels. Although the policy practice of grant-science is context specific (Daza, 2013), the speakers and their locations are not identified here on purpose. This analysis shifts the focus from humanist conceptions of individuals/authors to the material and discursive conditions that construct grant-science and its ambiguities.

The following paraphrases capture the spirit of ambiguity reflected from administrators and senior academics. They show that: (1) the value of grant activity is ambiguous and subject- and context-specific; (2) ac/counting and naming practices may be more important than the actual research; and (3) the time and energy ("effort" in grant-science) spent on funded research may be in/visible from different views.

You need a really big grant...

Even if you have a big external grant, you still need to apply for the small internal seed grants every year.

Even though your grants are multi-year [3 and 4 years], a grant only counts once on your annual productivity report.

How are your grants benefiting your unit?

Grant activity may be valued differently across different levels, e.g., programs, departments, colleges/ faculties, institution, organization/ community/society,

nationally, and globally. The meaning and value attributed to the kind (external or internal) and size (funding amount and duration) of grants may be relative and arbitrary. A major ambiguity of grant-science labor is the expectation that academics should always be applying for more external funding even if they cannot feasibly or legally do more labor. (e.g., Work effort at most institutions and funding agencies limits researchers from costing or buying out more than 100% of total time/salary with some allowances for summer salary on 9 and 10 month contracts in the US.) Not to mention, the real time and costs involved in doing funded projects is always more than what can be budgeted in Eurocentric and linear notions of time (Shahjahan, 2014).

You need to be PI, not co-PI...

According to the blue sheet, you are only Co-PI on the first grant, not the second grant...

You were just the diversity hire...

Before the process moved online, it seems the audit trail was on blue-colored paper. While labor and responsibilities on grants may stay the same, a different form and/or wording may raise questions about one's role and workload. The value of the grant may not be in the practice of doing it (e.g., the research!) but in how it is named and (ac)counted for, and who is/can do it? Calling the same kind and amount of labor something different actually matters.

One implication of this kind of reasoning is an affect/effect of neoliberal scientism. A kind of narcissism in managerial forms assume individuals are always deficient, lazy, and never doing enough. Despite the fact that chances are slim a new scholar without a funding track-record might score a major external grant as a PI, the expectation is that being co-PI is not good enough; the academic can always do more and better grant-science. The individualism and meritocracy embedded in neoliberal scientism (e.g., everyone has an equal chance in an equal playing field) assumes no need for induction or collaboration among junior, mid-career, or senior academics even though in practice large grant projects require multiple actors (see more on this below). While academic induction, mentoring, and collaboration among academics in higher education has never been value-free (Rhee & Subedi, 2009; Daza, 2012,

2013b), the current climate of grant-science both demands working together with multiple actors (often across disciplines, institutions, and fields) and makes it impossible at the same time as Rhee and Subreenduth discuss in their tale. A system, which only rewards individuals, challenges cooperation and parity (e.g.,

Scientific

American

, 2012).

You bought out your teaching with your grant money so you have free time ...

Since you don't have teaching, you should take this opportunity to read theory ...

Since you are just doing research, you can teach overload ...

You have to do 100% research, 100% teaching and 100% service ...

I'm not going to do [grants, productivity reports, etc.], it's time to retire...

These kinds of comments raised by senior academics and administrators prompts the following questions: What kind of understanding do colleagues have of the real labor (time, effort, emotion, intellect, etc.) it takes to do large-scale, multi-year grant projects and/or long-term empirical and ethnographic fieldwork today? How can academics reconcile the mathematical problem of laboring 300%? On one hand, funded research must not take much time or effort; on the other, some decide to retire rather than participate in grant-science.

The following paraphrases are from managerial staff, non-academics and sometimes accountants, who have been hired by universities to facilitate the additional workload of grant-science (calculating budgets, monitoring impact, auditing revenue):

My reading of the opportunity is that they are looking for XXXX rather than your idea ...

Priority is given to projects that generate income for the university. Your work won't be funded unless it has a potential income stream ...

Grant-science is very demanding on institutions of higher education. Institutions that aim to be competitive in generating external funding engage in capacity building of infrastructure to support grant-science and academics in searching for opportunities, writing proposals, developing budgets, and so on. While I agree that academics

cannot do this work alone, and in this way value the support of this infrastructure, the roles support-staff play as gatekeepers and knowledge brokers are unclear. A full professor with a grant track-record, expressed the concern as paraphrased: "I'm not sure I'll do any more grants. It's bad enough dealing with funders. Why is our institution's grant office so adversarial?"

Who has responsibility for the (intellectual) content of proposals in grant-science? I have written about the politics of proposal writing and how the proposal dictates the project (Daza, 2012, 2013). Preparing a proposal for an external funding can be very extensive. Federally funded projects might be 50-100 pages; some European Union projects are hundreds of pages. Some of the content on projects, such as impact statements, may be similar across projects. How is this knowledge and expertise owned, shared, and operationalized? As grant proposals and projects are developed, documents may be shared on cloud spaces, such as Dropbox. This information is hardly proprietary, although as researchers, who are modern-subject knowers, despite or in spite of a post world (Daza, 2009), we may struggle with a sense of ownership and/or alienation of our ideas and labor. Grant-science requires multiple actors to work together and this is an ambiguous endeavor every time, as actors and contexts of are always changing.

It is worth quoting Fitzgerald, Gunter, White, and Tight (2012) at length:

As the creation, production and dissemination of knowledge becomes increasingly influential in the globalised world (Appadurai, 2006; Roberts & Peters, 2008), importance is placed on more collective approaches to research and the need for collaboration between disciplines, fields, sites of knowledge production as well as between academics and practitioners, academics and the professions/industry as well as academics and 'end users' (Harney & Moten, 1998). Less clear is how academics negotiate their own spaces within these agendas to pursue and protect their scholarly interests. This might not be possible or permissible in a modernised university that seeks to preserve its own market share through an emphasis on making outputs calculable rather than memorable. Inevitably, academic values such as independence, autonomy, intellectual authority as well as prestige and status come into direct conflict

with external demands for accountability, transparency, entrepreneurialism

and economic regeneration. The cumulative effect of these new demands are:

• exponential pressures on time, workload and academic activities;

• an increased emphasis on performance, productivity and accountability that

has led to changing work patterns;

• expanding requirements to pursue private sector funds and undertake

consultancies and applied research;

• cultural shifts within universities as they seek opportunities for entrepreneurship,

commercialisation and internationalisation;

• centralisation of administrative tasks and activities while there is a devolution

of management and accountability to schools, departments and individuals;

• disproportionate numbers of women concentrated in lower levels of the

academic hierarchy; and

• disconnection between academics and universities as a result of the pressure

to offer specialised courses and meet the insistent demands of the educational

marketplace.

These demands have essentially altered academic work and what it means to

engage in productive academic work that is valued, recognised and rewarded.

…

The gains might well be efficiency, effectiveness and economic growth, but the

cost is low staff morale, low staff retention, a devaluing of academic work and

a sense of institutional loss as finance and policy officers take a larger role in

university governance and management. (pp. 5–6)

Academic research and researcher training relies on humanist concept of individuals

as authors, researchers, and knowers (Daza, 2009) not team research, shared

knowledge, or the notion that ideas are either not owned or owned by everyone.

Implications and Provocations

In a different kind of analysis I might analyze each comment above more specifically

to show how ambiguity plays out differently across different local/global and micro/

macro contexts. However, the purpose of this analysis is to show that mixed messages

and ambiguities of academic labor exist across contexts. My aim is to shift the focus

away from individuals and to the material and discursive conditions of grant-science that produce new ambiguities in academic labor. The point is to show the kind of reason—logics of grant-science—through which academic labor is made in/visible.

Of course, there always has been local/global and micro/macro power dynamics through which meaning is made and meaning making is always ambiguous, but in my part of this chapter, I am looking specifically at how the rules of success, failure and resistance in grant-science are very much emerging and in flux. While local, context-specific differences certainly exist, ambiguity of grant-science labor is a global trend across different contexts of higher education.

Like the other tales told here, mine also raises questions:

• What is the response ability of academics to infiltrate grant-science?

• What is the responsibility of academics in training (new) researchers (doctoral students) for grant-science and a continuously changing research and higher education context?

• Why do we (and should we) continue to prepare researchers as we were trained (e.g., in traditional doctoral programs, resulting in the doctoral dissertation, and modern-knowing-subjects, etc.)?

• What is our ability, and that of senior academics and even administrators, to effectively mentor new and early career researchers in these new contexts? As well as adjudicate promotion and tenure decisions?

• Are (and how are) faculty of color, women, and minorities, and those with minority views disproportionately impacted by grant-science?

• Since grant-science as a normative practice is unsustainable under current conditions of external funding-based policy practice, how can we reinvision higher education futures? Is this the end of higher education at least as we know it?

• And what is the role of academic labor and research within and beyond higher education to help future publics live with uncertainty and change?

Living in a post-world but clinging to positivist edges, the impetus in a standards-based regime of neoliberal scientism is the desire to shut-down ambiguity, resulting in calls for transparency, increased guidelines, and better monitoring. So, let me be clear: by examining these ambiguities I am not calling for more guidelines and

accountability. Because of grant-science in a digital age of neoliberal scientism, it is difficult to write anything that will not be mis/construed and shoehorned into these prevailing frameworks as a call for the technocratic labor of control and accountability rather than the recognition of uncertainty in knowledge production as generative (see Daza, 2013a). Instead, I argue that uncertainty, albeit not always fair and equitable, may be fertile ground. While there is no guarantee what exactly will happen, something is always already happening. Ambiguity offers hope that something different is on the way; the present is always already becoming the future (Daza, 2013a). Living peacefully with uncertainty and change is easier to say than do.

Grant-science has changed knowledge production and academic labor, but will it be the end of higher education? Perhaps "necessity

is the mother of invention." Out of re/de/forms of grant-science there may be new ways to be, live, know, do. This is not a

utopian view. What's next will not be outside of power dynamics. It's hard to imagine the end of higher education or grant-science. My own intervention is to try to get external funding for basic, inquiry-based research. Not only is basic research waning as funding agents place strict restrictions for application and impact on calls for proposals, basic education and social research has been disparaged within the field itself and this has contributed, I argue, to the neoliberal re/de/form industry and its calls for "(best) practice" and "what works," rather than more open ended pursuits (see Daza, 2013a).

CONCLUSION

In this chapter we provide three points of engagement with the policy, practice, and politics of the re/de/form industry in different post-secondary contexts of education. As our tales show, academics across contexts are trying to work within and against the re/de/form industry of neoliberal scientism. To speak through/to/with trepidation is what it means to speak truth to power. Put this way by Audre Lorde (1980):

I was going to die, sooner or later, whether or not I had even spoken myself. My silences had not protected me. Your silences will not protect you .... What are the tyrannies you swallow day by day and attempt to make your own, until you will sicken and die of them, still in silence? ...

With the rules of the grant-science game in constant flux and ambiguous, neither

success/failure nor reaction formations can be clear-cut. Unfortunately, and perhaps sobering for us academics, for most of the world and its laborers uncertainty is nothing new. What then do these tales produce? We present these tales as one mode of unearthing the hidden rules of grant-science within and outside higher education institutions. Probably a more profound expectation for us is to fracture the discourse around grant-science within this digital age of neoliberalism and create a space within to generate further ambiguities. These embodied tales defy traditional analysis and theorizing of the role of policy-based funding in higher education. It challenges readers to rethink about the ways in which academic laborers experience, play, and implement grant-science. These individual tales testify the impact of grant-science hegemony at the core of higher education—its faculty and students. At the end of the day, if nothing else, we invoke the spirit of Antonio Gramsci (1831–1937), and dare to speak difficult truths in the hope that we too can experience Lorde's (1980) conviction that not speaking is more frightening:

Because the machine will try to grind us into dust anyway, whether or not we speak. We can sit in out corners mute forever while our sisters and ourselves are wasted, while our children are distorted and destroyed, while our earth is poisoned, we can sit in our safe corners as mute as bottles, and still we will be no less afraid.

...

We can learn to work and speak when we are afraid .... For we have been socialized to respect fear ... while we wait in silence for that final luxury of fearlessness, the weight of that silence will choke us. (pp. 14–15)

NOTES

1

An in-depth discussion of scientism is beyond the scope of the chapter; Rupert Sheldrake's (2012).
The Science Delusion
offers a provocative account. See also Bowers (2011, 2014).

2

By STEM Culture, Daza (2013c) means the acronym STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering

and Mathematics) is becoming a globally recognized loaded concept on par with other organizing

principles of society like capitalism. That is, while most people do not become engineers, computer

programmers and mathematicians, we are all learning STEM Culture as it is embedded in the material

and discursive fabric of our societal structures (i.e., business, government, military, research and

development, school policy and curricula). The myopic focus on STEM to the detriment of other

disciplinary lenses, and a more aesthetic education (Spivak, 2012) is training future imaginaries to

think, be, act/do, and reason a STEM world, not unlike colonialism, capitalism, and neoliberalism

have done.

REFERENCES

AAUP . (1993). The work of faculty: Expectations, priorities, and rewards

. Washington, DC : The

American Association of University Professors' committee on teaching, research, and publication .

Retrieved from http://www.aaup.org/report/work-faculty-expectations-priorities-and-rewards

Adams, T . (2012 , February 5). Rupert Sheldrake: The 'heretic' at odds with scientific dogma . The Guardian .

Anzaldúa, G . (1987). Borderlands/la frontera . San Francisco, CA : Aunt Lute .

Arnove, R. F . (2005). To what ends: Educational reform around the world . Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies , 12 (1), 79 – 95 .

Bateson, G . (1971 / 2000). Steps to an ecology of mind . New York, NY : Ballantine .

Baez, B ., & Boyles, D . (2009). The politics of inquiry: Education research and the "culture of science ." New York, NY : SUNY Press .

Bidwell, A . (2014). Obama reaffirms old education promises in state of union address .

US News . Retrieved March 10, 2014 from http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2014/01/29

Bowers, C . (2011). Perspectivces on the ideas of gregory bateson, ecological intelligence, and educational reforms. Eugene, OR : Eco-Justice Press .

Bowers, C . (2014). The false promises of the digital revolution: How computers are changing education, work, and international development in ways that are ecologically unsustainable . New York, NY : Peter Lang .

Burnett, T . (2014). Scientism . Washington, DC : American Association for the Advancement of Science . Retrieved from http://www.aaas.org/page/what-scientism

Chin, J. L ., Lott, B ., Rice, J ., & Sanchez-Hucles, J . (2007). Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices . Malden, MA : Blackwell Publishing .

Daza, S. L . (2012). Complicity as infiltration: The im/possibilities of research with/in NSF engineering grants in the age of neoliberal scientism , Qualitative Inquiry , 18 (8), 773 – 786 .

Daza, S. L . (2013a). Putting Spivakian theorizing to work: Decolonizing neoliberal scientism in education . Educational Theory , 63 (6), 601 – 620 .

Daza, S. L . (2013b). A promiscuous (feminist) look at grant-science: How colliding imaginaries shape the practice of NSF policy . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education , 26 (5), 580 – 598 .

Daza, S. L . (2013c). The challenge of translation as improvisation in a digital age: Un/learning STEM culture and infiltrating grant-science [Presentation] . Chicago, IL : The American Anthropology Association .

Daza, S. L . (2013d). Reading texts, subtexts, and contexts: Effects of (post)colonial legacies in/on curricular texts in different contexts . Qualitative Research in Education , 2 (3), 206 – 212 .

Daza, S. L . (Ed.). (2013e). Reading texts, subtexts, and contexts: Effects of (post)colonial legacies in/on curricular texts in different contexts . Qualitative Research in Education , 2 (3), 206 – 354 .

Daza, S. L ., & Gershon, W . (in press). Research beyond the Eye/I: Sound, Silence and Sonification as Inquiry . Qualitative Inquiry. (20th Anniversary Issue)

Daza, S. L ., & Huckaby, M. F . (2014). Terra incognita em-bodied data analysis .

Qualitative Inquiry , 20 (6), 801 – 810 .

Daza, S. L ., & Rhee, J. E . (2013). A review of "Ecojustice education: Toward diverse, democratic, and sustainable communities." In R. A. Martusewicz , J. Edmondson , & J. Lupinacci (Eds.) ,

Educational studies (Vol. 49 , pp. 465 – 470). New York, NY : Routledge .

de Oliveira Andreotti, V. (2014). Conflicting epistemic demands in poststructuralist and postcolonial engagements with questions of complicity in systemic harm . Educational Studies , 50 (4), 378 – 397 .

De Walt, P. S . (2009). The harvesting of intellectuals and intellectual labor: The university system as a reconstructed/continued colonial space for the acquisition of knowledge . In A. Kempf (Eds.) , Breaching the colonial contract (pp. 201 – 217). The Netherlands : Springer .

Erevelles, N . (2011). Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic . New York, NY : Palgrave Macmillan .

Erickson, F . (1985). Qualitative methods in research on teaching (Occasional paper no. 81) . Washington, DC : National Institute of Education .

Foley, D. E . (1990). Learning capitalist culture deep in the heart of Tejas (2nd ed.) . Philadelphia, PA : University of Pennsylvania Press .

Fischman, G . (2009). Introduction . In D. Hill (Ed.) , Contesting neoliberal education: Public resistance and collective advance (p. 5). New York, NY : Routledge .

Fitzgerald, T ., Gunter, H ., White, J ., & Tight, M . (2012). Hard labour? Academic work and the changing landscape of higher education . Bradford : Emerald Group Publishing Limited .

Giroux, H . (2012 , October 16) . Can democratic education survive in a neoliberal society? Truthout . Retrieved from http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/1216 .

Hill, D ., & Kumar, R . (Eds.). (2012). Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences . New York, NY : Routledge .

Huckaby, F . (2014 , April 2). Public education: Voice, activism & uprising . Presentation given for the Education and Social Research Institute Seminar Series , Manchester Metropolitan University , Manchester, UK .

Hurtado, A . (2003). Theory in the flesh: Toward an endarkened epistemology . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education , 16 (2), 215 – 225 .

Kellerman, B ., Rhode, D. L ., & O'Connor, S. D . (2007). Women and leadership: The state of play and strategies for change (Vol. 141). San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass .

Kuhn, T. S . (1972/2012). The structure of scientific revolutions . Chicago, IL : University of Chicago press .

Kumashiro, K. K . (2008). The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools . New York, NY : Teachers College Press .

Kumashiro, K. K . (2012). Bad teacher!: How blaming teachers distorts the bigger picture

. New York, NY : Teachers College Press .

Lather, P . (2004). This is your father's paradigm: Government intrusion and the case of qualitative research in education . Qualitative Inquiry , 10 (1), 15 – 34 .

Lather, P . (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion . International journal of qualitative studies in education , 19 (1), 35 – 57 .

Lather, P . (2010). Engaging science policy: From the side of the messy (Vol. 345). New York, NY : Peter Lang .

Lave, R ., Mirowski, P ., & Randalls, S . (2010). Introduction: STS and Neo-liberal Science . Social Studies of Science , 40 (5), 659 – 675 .

Levinson, B. A ., Foley, D ., & Holland, D . (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice . Albany, NY : State University of New York Press .

Levinson, B. A ., Sutton, M ., & Winstead, T . (2009). Education policy as a practice of power theoretical tools, ethnographic methods, democratic options . Educational Policy , 23 (6), 767 – 795 .

Lewin, T . (2012 , February   12) . Money urged for colleges to perform job training.   The New York Times . Retrieved from   http://www.nytimes.com

Lipsitz, G . (2006).   The possessive investment in whiteness: How White people profit from identity politics . Philadelphia, PA :   Temple University Press .

Lorde, A . (1980).   The cancer journals: Special edition . San Francisco, CA : Aunt Lute Books .

Martusewicz, R .,   Edmundson, J ., &   Lipinacci, J . (2011).   Eco-justice education: Toward a diverse, democratic, and sustainable communities . New York, NY :   Routledge .

Mohanty,   C.   T .   (2003).   Feminism   without   borders: Decolonizing   theory,   practicing solidarity . New Delhi : Zubaan .

Mohanty, C. T .,   Russo, A ., &   Torres, L . (Eds.). (1991).   Third world women and the politics of feminism . Bloomington, IL : Indiana University Press .

Morrison, T . (1992).   Playing in the dark . Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press .

Mutua, K ., &   Swadener, B. B . (Eds.). (2004).   Decolonizing research in cross-cultural contexts: Critical personal narratives .   Albany , NY :   SUNY Press .

Ong, A . (2006).   Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty

.   Durham,   NC : Duke University Press .

Proctor, M ., &   Demerath, P . (2008).   Building the realism bridge: Shaping policy through collective research .   Language Arts , 86 (1),   42 – 51 .

Rhee, J. E . (2013a).   The neoliberal racial project: The tiger mother and governmentality .   Educational Theory ,   63 (6),   561 – 580 .

Rhee, J. E . (2013b).   Working on a failed research: Promiscuity of wanting and doing both ways . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education ,   26 (5),   553 – 566 .

Rhee, J. E . (2009).   International education, new imperialism, and technologies of self: Branding the globally educated self . Multicultural Education Review ,   1 (1),   55 – 81 .

Rhee, J. E ., &   Subreenduth, S . (Eds.). (2006). De/colonizing education: Examining transnational localities [Special issue] . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education ,   19 (5),   545 – 672 .

Sadker, D ., &   Zittleman, K . (2012).   Gender bias: From colonial America to today's classroom .

Multicultural Education: Issues and Perspectives (pp .   135 – 169).   Hoboken, NJ :   John Wiley & Sons, Inc .   Scientific American . (2012 ,   September   18).   Expand the Nobel prize to award teams, not just individuals , 307 (4).

Sheldrake, R . (2012).   The science delusion . London :   Hachette .

Shore, C ., &   Wright, S . (Eds.). (1997).   Anthropology of policy: Perspectives on governance and power . London :   Routledge .

Shahjahan, R. A . (2012). From "no" to "yes": Postcolonial perspectives on resistance to neoliberal higher education .   Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education ,   35 (3),   1 – 14 .

Shahjahan, R. A . (2014). Being 'lazy' and slowing down: Toward decolonizing time, our body, and pedagogy . Educational Philosophy and Theory , 1 – 14 .

Spretnak, C . (2011). Relational reality: New discoveries of interrelatedness that are transforming the world . Topsham, ME : Green Horizon Books . State of the Union Address . (2013). Retrieved March 18, 2014 , from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/13/US/politics/obamas-2013-state-of-the-union-address

State of the Union Address . (2014). Retrieved March 18, 2014 , from http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/full-text-of-obamas-2014

Subreenduth, S . (2013a). Theorizing social justice ambiguities in an era of neoliberalism: The case of postapartheid South Africa . Educational Theory , 63 (6), 581 – 600 .

Subreenduth, S . (2013b). Insidious colonialism in post-apartheid education: Interplay of black teacher narratives, educational policy and textbook analysis . Qualitative Research in Education , 2 (3), 213 – 241 .

Subreenduth, S . (2008). Deconstructing the politics of a differently colored transnational identity . Race Ethnicity and Education , 11 (1), 41 – 55 .

Subreenduth, S . (2006). ' Why, why are we not even allowed ...?': A de/colonizing narrative of complicity and resistance in post/apartheid South Africa . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education , 19 (5), 617 – 638 .

Subedi, B ., & Rhee, J. E . (2008). Negotiating collaboration across differences . Qualitative Inquiry , 14 (6), 1070 – 1092 .

Subreenduth, S ., & Rhee, J. E . (2010). A porous, morphing, and circulatory mode of self-other: Decolonizing identity politics by engaging transnational reflexivity . International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education , 23 (3), 331 – 346 .

Tuhiwai Smith, L . (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty . In

N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.) , The sage handbook of qualitative research (pp. 85 – 107). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage .

Tuhiwai Smith, L . (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples . London : Zed . U.S. Department of Education. (2011). Obama awards nearly 500 million in first round of grants to community colleges for job training . Retrieved March 5, 2014 from http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/

Van Maanen, J . (1988). Tales of the field: On writing ethnography . Chicago, IL : University of Chicago Press .

Weis, L ., & Fine, M . (2012). Critical bifocality and circuits of privilege: Expanding critical ethnographic theory and design . Harvard Educational Review , 82 (2), 173 – 201 .

Weis, L ., & Fine, M . (2013). A methodological response from the field to Douglas Foley: Critical bifocality and class cultural productions in anthropology and education . Anthropology & Education Quarterly , 44 (3), 222 – 233 .

Whitehead, A . (1978 / 2010). Process and reality . New York, NY : Simon and Schuster .

Ziker, J. P ., Wintermote, A ., Nolin, D ., Demps, K ., Genuchi, M ., & Meinhardt, K . (2014). Time distribution of faculty workload at Boise State University . Retrieved from http://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi