

Doing More Good, Doing Less Harm: Some Trends in Graduate Education

JOHN STEVENSON

THE present moment is an unsettled one for higher education in the United States. Those of us who work in colleges and universities find ourselves subject to something more than the kind of suspicion of intellectuals that has long found harbor in the American character. What we see is a more generalized and public demand for higher education to demonstrate its worth, a demand that is often expressed in language that leaves many of us uncomfortable with its unmistakable tang of accountancy: “transparency,” “accountability,” “value-added,” “benchmarks,” and so forth. The recent report of the Spellings Commission on the Future of Higher Education epitomizes this trend, and its conclusions include recommendations for higher education to improve in the areas of access, affordability, quality, and accountability.¹ Prompting these recommendations, the report makes clear, is one overriding concern: the fear that American higher education might lose its position of world preeminence, a preeminence marked (it is perhaps needless to say) not by the reverence this nation holds for the life of the mind but by higher education as the prime engine of what is always called “competitiveness.”² Competition, in this context, means an unapologetic insistence that the value of education is something that translates into tangible forms of value, especially economic value: innovations in technology and medicine, success in globalized markets, a well-trained workforce, and so forth.

One effect of these discussions has been to trigger greater attention in the public policy arena to graduate education in particular. As the emerging line of thought has it, the kind of innovation that makes a nation economically competitive is grounded in research, and the particular kinds of research that go on at research universities are

joined at their roots to graduate education. The recent report from the National Academies (self-described as “Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine”), “Rising above the Gathering Storm”—a title whose metaphoric ineptitude signals that no humanist was involved—is typical in its call for more attention to research to sustain American competitiveness, and while the report pays considerable attention to the deficits in math and science instruction in primary and secondary schools, it provides plenty of rhetorical ammunition for anyone who wants to use the importance of research as a means of bolstering graduate education in this country. The fate of graduate work in the humanities is, of course, unaddressed by those so keen to maintain our advantages in innovation and competition, but we can hope that there will be collateral benefits. The flight of Sputnik fifty years ago—a shock to the system that prompted this country to gear up substantial national resources to improve fundamental research—ultimately helped graduate students far afield from science and math: I myself was the recipient of National Defense Educational Act student loans, and it is a comfort to think my dissertation on the novelist Samuel Richardson was somehow of aid to my country.

While it is pleasant to imagine that some shower of gold will fall on English departments as a result

The author is associate dean of the graduate school and associate vice chancellor for graduate education at the University of Colorado, Boulder. A version of the article was presented at the 2006 ADE Summer Seminar East in Knoxville.

of a national desire to continue to train better engineers than the ones that India and China produce. I do not focus on that fantasy here. Rather, in this moment of greater attention to graduate education, I want to discuss a couple of trends, especially some pressures I see on graduate education to reform itself so that it more closely resembles, affectively at least, undergraduate education. Those pressures involve mentoring and degree completion. These matters have their place in the research and competitiveness debate taking place outside English departments, but they should—and I think, will—also have a place in our own disciplinary home.

As a way into this discussion, I want to consider a somewhat abstract question: What is it like to be a graduate student at this moment in the history of American higher education? What are we—as teachers and as administrators—doing or failing to do that would improve the experience of graduate study? Should improving that experience actually be our worry? Those are not, I think, questions that faculty members ask very often, although most of us have abundant personal experience to draw on. Our personal experience may, in fact, be an obstacle to clear sight, normalizing what we have known in our own lives as, after all, the only way that there could be, since it is the way that we took.

Like many readers of this essay, I have experienced graduate education from a number of perspectives: as recipient, as purveyor, and as administrator; I have learned, I have taught, and I have tried to make the trains run on time. I have recently, after many years as chair of English, moved into a position as associate dean of our graduate school, which provides another perspective entirely. While English departments occasionally turn their attention from the overwhelming quotidian demands of students and classes to larger questions of graduate education (usually when a curriculum becomes all too obviously obsolete), such discussions are—quite rightly—shaped by disciplinary questions. What we worry about on those occasions are matters like requirements and structure; what we do not generally talk about is the question I asked above, what is the experience of a graduate education like for our students? More important, we rarely ask, how does that experience translate into an ability to master the knowledge and skills that we want them to take away when they depart? The advantage of being in a graduate school is that it allows me to think about students

untethered from their disciplinary identities: they are graduate students as a species, not individual young Romanticists or Chaucerians.

To understand why mentoring, in particular, might be emerging as a central question in graduate education, we need to think about the relation between graduate and undergraduate education. The way in which these two enterprises do and do not align is a hallmark of the American university system (as, indeed, higher education and the K–12 system do not exactly fit like a hand in a glove). To speak only of the most obvious differences, one could point to an emphasis on teaching at the college level and on research in graduate schools or to the college's desire to educate generalists and to shape in some way the whole person, while graduate education strives to train specialists and professionals. Such discontinuities of identity are borne out by institutional structures that at most universities separate graduate schools (commonly linked to the institution's sponsored research office) from undergraduate colleges such as arts and sciences. At my own institution, and I am sure at others, this produces such oddities as the existence of two deans, one of arts and sciences and one of the graduate school, who have some pieces of jurisdiction over, say, the English department. When I was chair, this meant that I went to one office to petition grade and enrollment issues for undergraduates and to another for the graduate students in my department.

A stark emotional contrast reinforces the differences in educational goals and institutional structures: one's undergraduate years are, at least as the myth has it, the best years of one's life, a time of new freedom and new friendships, a space in which freshly hatched adults explore themselves and the world. In sad contrast to this idyll is the mythos of graduate school: a time of toil and trouble, long hours, low pay, intense isolation, negligent advisers; and all these sacrifices are undertaken beneath the bemused or skeptical gaze of a world that can't stop itself from asking, in mock horror, "You're not still in school, are you?" In college, the totemic beverage is beer; in graduate school, it is coffee, probably way too much coffee, and that synecdochic distinction may say it all.

There is also the question of visibility. While graduate education looms large on the campuses of research universities and (at least for the moment) in the eyes of policy makers, it is not something on the minds of most people, even educated

people. In the popular mind, higher education means the bachelor's degree, and we refer to the products of higher education as college graduates even if, as so many do, they attended a university with a broad range of graduate and undergraduate degrees. It was illuminating to see, in my state of Colorado, that undergraduate tuition increases for my campus (badly needed ones, I might add) were held last year to an inadequate 2.5% because of widespread political opposition to a larger jump; graduate tuition, by contrast, rose 9% and nobody (aside from a few graduate students) said a word. Graduate study may well be an integral cog in the engine that drives American competitiveness, but it is pretty well hidden beneath the hood.

Too strict an insistence, however, on these discontinuities would also be a mistake, and seen from other angles, the great gulf begins to disappear. Who is it, after all, who teaches these undergraduates? The faculty members, both tenure-track and adjunct, at every kind of institution and with only rare exceptions, all went to graduate school and earned advanced degrees. The specialization, professionalization, and research orientation of their graduate work, paradoxically, prepared them—or now allows them—to teach general education or the more amateur specialization of the major. Even more striking, perhaps (at least at advanced-degree-granting institutions such as my own), are the legions of graduate students teaching undergraduates, and in many English departments we can observe what might be the single hardest and most important course on any campus, freshman composition, being taught by doctoral or even master's students. To state an obvious but important point: graduate education may seem to be invisible to the larger world, but undergraduate education would not exist without it.

Even the division between research and teaching, which appears to be fundamental, blurs under scrutiny. If (and again, I am speaking of advanced-degree-granting schools) we look across campus at the work our colleagues in the sciences and engineering are doing in their labs, we can spot teams made up of professors, graduate students, and undergraduates, in a milieu where teaching and research are not easily separated. Even in the humanities, where it is all too easy to draw a line between the public discourse of the classroom and the private research that professors pursue in soli-

tude, apparently sharp distinctions yield to more complicated realities. The precise value of what a humanities professor does by him- or herself when pursuing research has proved devilishly difficult to articulate for a skeptical public (and skeptical administrators), but I know that anyone reading this essay understands that without those efforts our classrooms would quickly become impoverished intellectual spaces. Research, in other words, is not just a matter for the graduate school. That may be the place where we learn to do research in a professional way—whether it's archival or editorial work, sustained interpretative argumentation, theory, or cultural studies—but if we are good at what we do, our professionalism in research also energizes and deepens our work with students, including undergraduates. It does much more than that, to be sure, though (as John Guillory has eloquently argued) if the primary or only audience for our best scholarship turns out to be our students, that is not necessarily a bad thing and is in fact a path to nurture and protect.³

My field is eighteenth-century Britain, and I am tempted at this point to invoke Alexander Pope's ideal of *concordia discors* and think of the college and graduate school as he did of the English landscape in "Windsor Forest":

Here Hills and Vales, the Woodland and the Plain,
Here Earth and Water seem to strive again,
Not Chaos-like together crush'd and bruis'd,
But as the World, harmoniously confus'd:
Where Order in Variety we see,
And where, tho'all things differ, all agree. (11–16)

The poet who wrote these lines was, of course, both very young and an optimist, and he clearly never attended a meeting of an English department where curriculum or hiring was discussed. All of us surveying the landscape of higher education may discern more confusion than order, more voices demanding accountability than celebrating concord. But on the issues of mentoring and degree completion, there may be something of a convergence (harmonic? I'm not sure) taking place, and I would like to look at those questions now more closely in the light of the context I have tried to create.

Before discussing mentoring, I need to pause over the nomenclature: is mentoring the same as advising? The figure of the adviser, sometimes also known as the director, is nearly as totemic an image of graduate study as that cup of coffee. She or

he is the one who is supposed to guide (but who sometimes blocks) the advanced student along the perilous path to full professionalism. An undergraduate may do an honors thesis under faculty direction or have a faculty adviser in the major department, but there is no one at that level like the person who bestrides the destiny of a graduate student, supervising the research but also and more numinously transforming an amateur into a professional. There is also rarely anyone at the undergraduate level with a graduate adviser's capacity to do real, sometimes permanent damage.

Mentorship may or may not come into that equation. I confess that I cannot ever recall anyone using the word *mentor* when I was in graduate school in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Like everybody else, I had a director. Some student-director relationships were better than others, but mentorship was not something I or other people fretted about. We worried about many things, but I do not recollect anyone asking (over coffee, of course), "Am I getting the mentoring I need?" To risk a generalization, then, I would say that in the traditional economy of higher education, graduate students have necessarily had advisers or directors, while undergraduates, if they were lucky, have had mentors, someone to spark an interest in a field of study, who could lead a good student toward graduate school or another career path. We think of *in loco parentis* as the principle that once governed rules of campus behavior for undergraduates, but it also suggests the possibility in the college years of finding quasi-familial bonds. The first sort of title—adviser, director—suggests a business relationship: lawyers and bosses offer advice and direction; mentorship, however, suggests something else, warmth and support and experiential wisdom. My hypothesis here is meant not to say that mentoring has never been a part of the graduate school experience but only to remind us that advanced study has typically implied a survival of the fittest mentality not always consistent with the close personal relationship that a word like *mentor* suggests.

One important thing I have learned in my time in the graduate school is that mentoring, in just the terms traditionally associated with an ideal undergraduate experience, turns out to be what today's graduate students explicitly want. The idea seems to have percolated up into the historically oppressed consciousness of this population that they deserve not just professional treatment and proper direction

but nurturing. They want more than advice; they want a helping relationship. I base this assertion not only on my feel for the pulse of my campus but also on Boulder's involvement with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation's Responsive PhD project and my conversations, in November 2005, with graduate students from around the country at the Graduate Student Leadership Conference that was one of the outgrowths of that effort.⁴ Those impressive students talked about many issues, but the one they kept coming back to was their desire to forge strong mentoring relationships. What remains unclear to me is how distinctly specifiable that desire is. They want something more than what they have, but the question remains: If you gave them something better, would it be the mentor they want? Before I return to that question, I want to consider the origins of this perceived need for mentoring.

Where did the change in graduate student expectations come from? Shifting demographics may have something to do with it. Graduate education has generally been a form of asexual reproduction, Shakespearians producing new Shakespearians and so on, but a degree of formality and distance in the reproductive process may have been more acceptable when the newborns looked a lot like those who produced them: white, male, ready and able to be socialized to the odd tribal customs of academic life. Other large social trends are also in play: there was a time when a certain harshness in superior-subordinate relations was an accepted part of the landscape in any workplace, the graduate seminar included, when bullying was a fact of life as inescapable as bad weather and not a problem for social scientists and institutions to study and solve. We are less tolerant of such behavior now, especially in education, even if those problems remain.

There is also the issue of so-called professionalization, the expectation that graduate students will give papers at conferences and publish their work. I am not sure that professionalization is the right word to describe what has happened. After all, the whole point of graduate training has always been to produce professionals. What has changed is that graduate students involve themselves in certain kinds of professional activity at an earlier point in their training than they did formerly. Their entry into venues where they rarely ventured twenty-five or so years ago means that there have come to be new rituals to master, new norms to understand: What makes a good conference paper? When a

journal says, "revise and resubmit," what do they really want? One result is that many students need help in mastering—or even tackling—kinds of work that previous generations could wait longer to learn. Again, however, the line between what an adviser might do with regard to these activities and what a mentor might provide is unclear to me. Is a mentor the one you ask, "Do I need to wear a tie when I read my paper?"

Finally, I also have the sense—more intuitive than empirical—that the desire for the mentor figure has stitched itself deeply into our cultural fabric and that people aspiring to professional success, in whatever field, want a warm and helpful guide. They may be apprentices, but they don't want to be treated like the beleaguered apprentices in the narratives of old. It is hard to argue with this desire, and I find myself even now longing for such a figure to lend me a hand. I recall Lear: "How dost, my boy? Art cold? I am cold myself." But whether an answer to such desires can be institutionalized is another question, which I address in my conclusion.

The second issue, degree completion, is profoundly related to mentoring, and it raises some of the same questions about institutional responsibility. As an issue in higher education, degree completion has been on the table for a while now, though it has taken on a somewhat different coloration as it has become part of the accountability and competitiveness discussion. Historically, whether or not someone completed a graduate degree, especially a doctorate, was not a matter of much concern, a reflection of an attitude not too difficult to explain. Those of you who have had the distinctly unpleasant experience of membership on a comprehensive exam committee where the student fails are familiar no doubt with that spine-stiffening voice who reminds the group, "Well, we don't just give away the PhD, you know." Since difficulty and danger are inherent in the attainment of a graduate degree, a palpable washout rate has often been regarded as a sign of rigor, an indication that the less talented and the less disciplined have been identified and excluded.

Now, it is certain that the PhD is not for everyone, not even necessarily for everyone who enters a doctoral program. Graduate admissions committees are not infallible, and given the kind of inconsistencies inherent in their decentralized nature, the process of selection is probably just as problematic at the higher level as it is for undergradu-

ate admissions—though again, the invisibility of graduate education to the general public has kept that issue from the kind of frenzied discussion that admissions at selective colleges has engendered. More to the point, people change their minds—inside graduate school an academic career can look very different from the way it appeared to an undergraduate. That is, there will always be mistakes, either by departments in evaluating talent at entry or by individuals in assessing their true interests. But what about students who have the aptitude and who want to finish but nonetheless fail to do so? That is the component of the washout rate that is worrisome, as a human cost and as a staggering waste of money and of time by both students and faculty members.

What to do about that waste? And is waste even the right way to think about those who do not complete their degree? Is it a waste when someone discovers (or is persuaded) that they lack the aptitude or interest to finish a PhD? Is degree completion always good, especially for those of us in the humanities, where the number of tenure-track jobs has remained stubbornly much lower than the supply of candidates seeking such positions? Universities, foundations, and professional organizations have been paying attention to the completion question for a while now, though the pace has intensified and a number of institutions are currently participating in a grant-funded initiative, the Doctoral Completion Project, sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools. Other studies and projects, including the Responsive PhD and the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, have been motivated in part by the idea that low rates of completion at the graduate level are not a sign of healthy rigor and high standards but a symptom of institutional disease—or at least institutions in need of reform.⁵ We are investing our limited resources in an endeavor with a high failure rate, and, in some circles, that seems increasingly hard to defend, especially in a climate where the public is more inclined to turn an inspector's eye on graduate education than ever before. That perception is grounded in good cost-benefit analysis, but it also probably reflects a movement of ideas we have long taken for granted about undergraduate education into our thinking about graduate study—that is, the belief that we want students to succeed, that we want to give them the support necessary for success, and that we want them to finish.⁶

Many readers, I am sure, are as uncomfortable as I am with the evolution of higher education in the United States toward institutional behaviors associated with (for lack of a better term for a complex phenomenon) business models. That development has manifested itself recently in the use of competitiveness as a framework for discussions of the future of higher education, but it has long been an emerging line of thought and has been most readily apparent in the now widespread belief that colleges and universities need to market or brand themselves and (even more troubling) in the concept that students are customers and that the education we offer them is our product. Typical is the recent e-mail I received from a higher education marketing firm: "In today's changing Higher Education market do you have the right tools to drive students to your institution? We invite you to spend an hour hearing how [our business] sees the changing market dynamics and how [one university] is building 'relationship capital' with their community of prospects, students and alumni." Their big promise is that they will provide the means to enhance "Constituent Relationship Management." It is all too easy to groan and to wish for more comprehensive spam filters: the language, saturated as it is with "market dynamics" and "right tools," seems as far removed from academic values as possible, and that key verb "drive" seems less vehicular than like some sad subjugation. It is the kind of message that, well, drives many of us crazy.

At the same time, ironically to some, the important developments I have been talking about here—the demand by graduate students for mentoring, the growing belief that the completion of graduate degrees matters—are clearly related to the emergence of a business model for higher education. Perhaps we should ponder that irony rather than point to it as a reason to dismiss these trends. Should we resist or despise the emergence of mentoring and completion as central issues in graduate education just because somebody who recognizes a market niche has translated those ideas into another language and calls them "building relationship capital"? On the contrary, there are fundamental academic and educational values at stake. If we are doing our jobs thoughtfully, it should matter to us a great deal whether or not graduate students are able to do the work and earn the degrees that they came to graduate school to achieve.

But the challenging and in many ways baffling question remains: how do we calibrate the responsibilities, on the one hand, of the faculty and the institution and, on the other, of the student? How much of the quality of their experience is our responsibility and how much is theirs? This is not at all easy to sort out. In my still relatively short time as a dean in our graduate school, I have heard about (and tried to act on) some really bad behavior inflicted by faculty members on their graduate students—intellectual brutality, sabotage, exploitation, abandonment. Such behavior is the opposite of mentoring (though some faculty members still think it consistent with the perquisites of being an adviser), and it surely impedes progress toward the degree. Rules of behavior begin with the oldest professional commandment: First, do no harm. But real harm is being done, every day. This kind of misbehavior demands strong institutional intervention, which we try to provide.

That intervention can take several forms. Institutions must work to guarantee advisers' professional behavior, but they must also help students understand what they can expect. To that end, I have led two workshops for graduate students called "Getting the Mentoring You Need." One important fact about those sessions is that I tried to instill in my audience an understanding that students have a right to expect, even demand, a certain level of respect and guidance and that such an expectation exists wholly outside the existence or nonexistence of a mentor. In other words, I try to help them understand that they do not necessarily have to find a mentor to have a good adviser. That advice addresses in a fundamental way both the quality of experience for all graduate students and how we, as faculty members and administrators, might shape that experience so as to improve what students are able to achieve. But I have also talked in these workshops about the more elusive ideal of mentorship and emphasized to students that finding a mentor will remain their responsibility, that it is something that they discover, even create, and that it is not a product whose supply we can guarantee. Put another way, "adviser" is a job description and can be regulated; "mentor" is a relationship, and we all know how well relationships can be regulated. And if more advisers learn not just to behave but to understand the kinds of help their students require and if more students succeed in finding mentors, then improved degree completion should (note the

conditional) follow. Certainly, completion at the graduate level must be as much of a priority as it is at the undergraduate level, and every university should seek out and remove those barriers—not just bad advising but obsolescent curriculum as well—that impede progress.

Here, however, is my cautionary note: the achievement of a graduate degree, like any real achievement in life, must be predicated on the possibility of failure. What that means, with regard to the issues I have been discussing, is that we should always be afraid of wasting talent, but we forget at our peril that talent sometimes wastes itself. Think of Richard II: “I wasted time, and now doth time waste me.” That is a reality in higher education that we cannot reform out of existence. Completion will never be one hundred percent; some relationship capital will always be squandered. But although we cannot reform away the possibility of self-destruction, other reforms are possible, especially in a climate where important issues have become clear. Happily, at least for a moment, this country is rethinking graduate education, and that new attention provides us with an opportunity to solve some of the problems that better mentoring and better completion rates are meant to address. If graduate education becomes—affectively, anyway—more like the best kind of undergraduate education, then that is a cause for celebration.

Notes

1. For the full text of the report, see www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/index.html. The classic account of anti-intellectualism in the United States remains Richard Hofstadter's *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. I vividly recall the realization I had when I first read Hofstadter decades ago: that the history of American anti-intellectualism is also largely the history of American education. For a valuable perspective on accountability, see Laurence.

2. The sudden ubiquity of competitiveness in relation to education in general and graduate education in particular is impossible to overstate. In early 2006, President Bush announced the “American Competitiveness Initiative” (see www.whitehouse.gov/stateoftheunion/2006/aci/), which promises additional federal funding for education and basic research. In June 2006, the Council of Graduate Schools published “Graduate Education and American Competitiveness,” a DVD that “focuses on how declining public investments in graduate education are threatening American competitiveness and global economic leadership.” The subcommittee in the United States House of Representatives that oversees higher education has recently been renamed

the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning, and Competitiveness. The list could go on.

3. Guillory's point is part of his larger argument about the evaluation of scholarship in tenure and promotion decisions, among other moments of academic accountability. That question is also the subject of the recent report of the MLA Task Force on Evaluating Scholarship for Tenure and Promotion; see www.mla.org/tenure_promotion.

4. The Responsive PhD was a five-year effort of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and its activities including a number of national meetings (there were two Graduate Student Leadership Conferences, in 2003 and 2005); the foundation issued a final report, “The Responsive PhD: Innovations in U. S. Doctoral Education,” in September 2005; see www.woodrow.org/responsivephd. The proceedings of the two conferences are available at www.ncgsi.wustl.edu.

5. If one goes to the Council of Graduate Schools Web site and clicks on the link to Programs and Awards and then on the PhD Completion Project, one immediately encounters this sentence, “Attrition in U. S. doctoral programs is a tremendous waste of America's financial resources and human energies.” And then, in the second sentence, there is the inevitable linkage of this assertion to “growing concerns over workforce issues that relate to the vitality and competitiveness of the U. S. economy.” The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate has been sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and has involved departments in six disciplines, including English, who were willing to restructure their programs to produce PhDs who were better prepared for research and teaching careers; see www.carnegie-foundation.org/programs/. The scholar whose work is most closely associated with the completion issue is formerly a Senior Scholar at the Carnegie Foundation, Chris M. Golde. William Bowen and Neil Rudenstine's *In Pursuit of the PhD* is an important, earlier (1992) look at doctoral completion.

6. There is another, radically different way of looking at this issue, exemplified by Mark Bousquet's “The Waste Product of Graduate Education: Toward a Dictatorship of the Flexible.” His contrarian argument is that in fact it is completed PhDs who represent a “waste product”: since the goal of the corporate university is to accumulate capital and since the cheapest form of academic labor is the graduate student teacher, the bestowal of the doctorate represents the moment that the exploited worker is ejected from the system. Bousquet argues with a fine, old-style Marxist fervor, but his remarkable polemic is handicapped by a general absence of supporting data and a tendency to view the world of the English department as identical with the world of the university. He takes for granted that graduate students are primarily supported by teaching, and he assumes that unemployment is the inevitable fate of those students who succeed in gaining their PhD. There is just enough truth in those assumptions for his essay to make those of us who inhabit English departments think about what we are doing, but if Bousquet's analysis is meant to be a definitive critique of a structure of exploitation that characterizes the contemporary university, there is a great deal going on in other disciplines that he does not mention, much less account for.

Bousquet launches his argument by recalling the (now, in retrospect) heartbreaking optimism of William Bowen and

Julie Ann Sosa's 1989 predictions of a significant improvement in employment prospects for humanities PhDs. That prediction was overwhelmed by developments he did not anticipate, probably because we always tend to anticipate the future as an extension of the past and the 1990s saw instead the end of mandatory retirement and—even more devastating—funding shortages that produced an explosion in the use of contingent labor rather than the hiring of shiny new assistant professors. For Bousquet, however, Bowen and Sosa's error is not evidence of the inevitability of human error in the game of predictions but part and parcel of the whole tenebrous design of the employment system in higher education.

Works Cited

- Bousquet, Mark. "The Waste Product of Graduate Education: Toward a Dictatorship of the Flexible." *Social Text* 20.1 (2002): 81-104.
- Bowen, William G., and Julie Ann Sosa. *Prospects for the Faculty in Arts and Sciences: A Study of Factors Affecting Demand and Supply, 1987-2012*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1989.
- Bowen, William G., and Neil L. Rudenstine. *In Pursuit of the PhD*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.
- Council of Graduate Schools. "Graduate Education and American Competitiveness." DVD. Washington: CGS, 2006.
- Golde, Chris M. "Should I Stay or Should I Go?: Student Descriptions of the Doctoral Attrition Process." *Review of Higher Education* 23.2 (2000): 199-227.
- Guillory, John. "Evaluating Scholarship in the Humanities: Principles and Procedures." *ADE Bulletin* 137 (2005): 18-33.
- Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Vintage, 1963.
- Laurence, David. "Engaging Accountability." *ADE Bulletin* 137 (2005): 3-5.
- National Academies. "Rising above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Engaging America for a Brighter Economic Future." Washington: Natl. Acads., 2006. <<http://www.nap.edu/catalog/11463.html#toc>>.
- Pope, Alexander. "Windsor Forest." *The Poems of Alexander Pope: A One-Volume Edition of the Twickenham Text with Selected Annotations*. Ed. John Butt. London: Methuen; New Haven: Yale UP, 1963. 195-210.
- Woodrow Wilson Foundation. "The Responsive PhD: Innovations in U.S. Doctoral Education." Princeton: Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 2005.