Higher Education Governance & Policy

ISSN: 2717-8676 **Volume:** 1 **Issue:** 2

The Emergence of the New Mexican Academic Meritocracy

Jesús Francisco Galaz Fontes[1], Jorge Martínez Stack[2], & Manuel Gil Antón[3]

[1]Department of Sociology, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Azcapotzalco, Mexico City, Mexico
[2]Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
[3]Center for Sociological Studies, El Colegio de México, Mexico City, Mexico

Article Type: Review Article

Corresponding Author: Jesús Francisco Galaz Fontes, galazfontes@gmail.com

Cite as: Galaz Fontes, J. F., Martínez Stack, J., & Gil Antón, M. (2020). The Emergence of the new Mexican academic meritocracy. *Higher Education Governance & Policy*, *1*(2), 138-151.

Access: https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1401146

Higher Education Governance & Policy
ISSN: 2717-8676
Volume: 1
Issue: 2

The Emergence of the New Mexican Academic Meritocracy

Jesús Francisco Galaz Fontes[1*], Jorge Martínez Stack[2], & Manuel Gil Antón[3]
[1]Department of Sociology, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Azcapotzalco, Mexico City, Mexico
[2]Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City, Mexico
[3]Center for Sociological Studies, El Colegio de México, Mexico City, Mexico

Abstract

Immersed in a local and global contextualized higher education expansion process, the Mexican academic profession has undergone a profound reconfiguration during the last decades. Its socio-demographic, training, work, attitudes, and career have all change in a significant way, particularly amongst full-time academics. During this period, policies directed at public higher education have centred on a performance-based funding scheme that has generated a strong stratification amongst institutions, students, and faculty. Created in 1984, the National Researchers System (SNI), the first such policy, was directed at full-time faculty involved in research and served as a seed for future policies. This paper discusses the role of SNI as a cornerstone not only in the reconfiguration of the academic profession, but also in the emergence of an academic meritocracy that sits on top of a pyramid in terms of resources and prestige within the academic profession, many of whose members, particularly those oriented towards teaching and even more so part-time faculty, are excluded from adequate working conditions and recognition. Considering this situation as unsustainable, the proposal is made to move the SNI merit-based logic that now applies to all faculty working at a public higher education institution, into each institution individually, where its mission would play a central role in determining faculty work, career, and rewards. By making academic work and careers root in each of the institutions in which faculty work, the proposal aims at building an inclusive meritocracy much in need at this stage of Mexican higher education.

Keywords: Academic profession, meritocracy, Mexico, public policies

Introduction

During the second half of the 20th century Mexican higher education enrolment expanded substantially, from an elite system to a system for minorities and then to a mass system (Rama, 2009).[1] While the gross enrolment rate was 2.7% in 1960 (Casillas Alvarado & de Garay Sánchez, 1992), by 2019 it had reached 41.6% (SEP, 2020).[2] Amid this growth there have been not only financial challenges, but many others —student body, academic and administrative staff, educational programs, facilities, etc.—, just as Trow (1973) envisioned in reflecting on the transition from an elite to a mass higher education system.

Certainly, the recent evolution of Mexican higher education has been shaped by its expansion process, but the specific ways in which it has developed are intimately tied to its initial state, the nature of the national political system and the economic structure of the country. While higher education initial state determined the profile and training of its professoriate, among other aspects, the political system has

[*] **Corresponding Author:** Jesús Francisco Galaz Fontes, galazfontes@gmail.com
[1]ORCID: 0000-0001-6520-6227; ***[2]ORCID:*** 0000-0001-7577-6530; ***[3]ORCID:*** 0000-0001-9184-8346

(Review Article) **Cite as:** Galaz Fontes, J. F., Martínez Stack, J., & Gil Antón, M. (2020). The Emergence of the new Mexican academic meritocracy. *Higher Education Governance & Policy, 1*(2), 138-151.

Received: November 17, 2020; ***Revised:*** December 21, 2020; ***Accepted:*** December 22, 2020; ***Published:*** December 30, 2020

[1] For Trow (1973) the enrolment rates that identify a higher education system as being elite, mass, or universal are, respectively, up to 5%, up to 50% and 51% and more. Rama (2009), considering the Latin American context, has proposed the elite (0-15%), minorities (16-30%), mass (31-50%), universal (51-85%) and absolute (86-100%) stages.
[2] Given the Mexican population dynamic this percentual change implied going from attending 78,753 undergraduate students, to attending 4,931,200 (including graduate students).

influenced the coordination and governance of the higher education system and its institutions. Lastly, the economic structure of the country has been key in orienting the undergraduate academic programs offered and, at the graduate level, its growth and articulation with scientific research as well as with its social and productive milieu (Ibarra Colado, 2010).

An additional factor that has strongly influenced the contemporary development of Mexican higher education has been the global implementation of neoliberal policies. Intensified world-wide during the 1980s (Escalante Gonzalbo, 2015), neoliberalism promoted a type of globalization where the idea of the U.S. research university became the hegemonic model that any institution of higher education had to imitate if its aspired recognition as a "world class" university (Marginson & Ordorika, 2011; Salmi, 2009). Nevertheless, the efforts to respond to globalization imitating such a model in Mexico, as in many other countries with socioeconomic conditions quite different from the "first world" trying to be emulated, have led many institutions to poorly attend their local realities and surroundings (Balbachevsky, 2016; Cantwell & Maldonado-Maldonado, 2009).

In its development, Mexican higher education has undergone a significant rate of institutional diversification (Teichler, 2009), which in turn has been associated with greater faculty differentiation (Rubio Oca, 2006). Such diversification, however, taking place in the Mexican political, economic, and aspirational context under the framework of neoliberal globalization, has induced an upsurge in institutional and academic stratification in which certain institutions and faculty have settled, in terms of resources and prestige, atop the academic pyramid (Didou Aupetit & Gérard, 2010; Mendoza Rojas, 2018). This condition has also been precipitated by a public funding system of higher education based on performance evaluation and the attainment of indicators that essentially mirror the American research university model promoted by international rankings (Ordorika & Lloyd, 2013).

In this general context the main purpose of this work is twofold. First, to advance the hypothesis that a small segment of Mexican academics has turned into a new aristocratic meritocracy —with characteristics similar to those Markovits (2019), Sandel (2020) and Young (1961) describe for meritocracies in countries with developed economies— and, secondly, to propose an alternative that would safeguard the positive aspects of the experienced "meritocratization" process while minimizing its negative collateral effects.

Under this perspective, this work is organized in three sections and a final reflection and proposal. The first section briefly describes the reconfiguration of the academic profession in Mexico over the last three decades. In the second section the central idea of the text is developed: that a new "aristocratic academic meritocracy" has emerged in recent times. The third section comments some elements of the way in which this new academic meritocracy conceives its work and the rewards it receives from it. Finally, a proposal attempting to retain the achievements of a meritocratic approach to academic work, while reducing its undesirable effects, is made.

The Reconfiguration of the Academic Profession in Mexico

By 1980, in only two decades, Mexican higher education enrolment had grown more than 800% relative to 1960, and faculty positions had increased more than 500% (Casillas Alvarado & de Garay Sánchez, 1992). At the same time, Mexican academics presented, in general terms, a professionally fragile profile. Less than 20% of its faculty had a full-time contract, most did not have any thorough professional experience and had not completed graduate studies, and they were essentially engaged in teaching undergraduate-level classes without adequate preparation for it. Additionally, they carried out little research and their collaboration with international colleagues occurred in very specific fields, where only a small number of academics from a few institutions were involved (Gil Antón, 1996; Gil Antón et al., 1994).

After some important pioneering studies on Mexican faculty (Gil Antón et al., 1992; Kent Serna, 1986a, 1986b), several national surveys were carried out from 1992 thereon: in 1992 (Gil Antón et al., 1994), 2002 (Grediaga Kuri, Rodríguez Jiménez, & Padilla González, 2004), 2007 (Galaz Fontes et al., 2012) and 2018 (Estévez Nenninger et al., 2018). Using the respective databases that will be referenced as

1992, 2002, 2007 and 2018, what follows is a very general description of the evolution of a small set of characteristics of full-time Mexican academics that talk about their reconfiguration during the last four decades.[3]

In relation to age, when compared with the year 1992, faculty in 2018 reported a rise in average age, from 42.0 to 52.5 years (see Table 1). More specifically, the percentage of faculty aged 60+ went up, from 3.8%, in 1992, to 25.7%, in 2018, while faculty under 40 years of age decreased, in the same time period, from 44.1% to 11.2%.

Regarding sex, percentages of full-time female faculty increased between 1992 and 2018, from 30.3% to 43.9% (see Table 1). Even though the last percentage is still far from being a parity figure, percentages of female faculty relative to all academics under 40 years of age in each survey, have consistently risen: 33.0% for 1992, 43.0% for 2002, 45.0% for 2007 and 51.1% for 2018.

Regarding their educational level, the surveyed faculty who reported having a bachelor's degree as their highest degree decreased between 1992 and 2018, from 64.9% to 6.8% (see Table 1). At the same time, faculty who reported having completed a Ph.D. in that same period rose from 9.4% to 56.6%. This difference reflects, on the one hand, that a considerable percentage of academics completed their graduate studies while already working in their respective institutions, in not few cases thanks to federal and institutional programs (Padilla González, 2007), and on the other, the fact that a higher percentage of new personnel is entering institutions with a graduate degree. Thus, over the years the percentage of hired academics who access their first contract with completed Ph.D. studies has increased considerably: 2.2% in 1992, 3.6% in 2002, 12.4% in 2007 and 19.9% in 2018 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Several characteristics regarding the reconfiguration of Mexican full-time faculty, 1992-2018[1]

Characteristic	Year			
	1992[2]	2002[3]	2007[4]	2018[5]
Average age (years)	42.0	45.9	49.9	52.5
Sex (percentage of females of FT faculty)	30.3	36.2	35.7	43.9
Highest degree at the time of the survey				
Bachelors	64.9	41.1	24.8	6.8
Masters	25.8	36.6	41.8	36.6
Doctorate	9.4	22.3	33.5	56.6
Highest degree at first academic contract				
Bachelors	90.1	86.4	62.0	55.7
Masters	7.7	10.1	25.6	24.4
Doctorate	2.2	3.6	12.4	19.9
Family educational background (percentage)				
At least one parent with higher education	32.2	31.5	36.1	47.0
(For Faculty under 40 years)	31.5	34.9	47.9	65.6
Hours per week devoted to:				
Teaching (time in classes)	22.7	12.5	12.5	10.9
Research	-	6.3	10.2	9.7
Academic preference leaning towards:				
Teaching	59.2[6]	-	55.6	40.6
Research	40.8	-	44.4	59.4

[1] All figures were derived directly from the databases of the surveys enlisted below.
[2] Traits of Diversity survey: NT = 3,764; NFT = 1,619 (Gil Antón et al., 1994).
[3] Public Policies survey: NT = 3,861; NFT = 1,775 (Grediaga Kuri, Rodríguez Jiménez, & Padilla González, 2004).
[4] Mexican CAP survey: NT = 1,973; NFT = 1,775 (Galaz Fontes et al., 2012).
[5] Mexican APIKS survey: NT = 4,668; NFT = 3,757 (Estévez-Nenninger et al., 2020). Figures for this survey differ from those in the referenced paper due to the use, in this work, of a weighing procedure developed afterwards.
[6] This figure corresponds to the 1992 Carnegie International Survey of the Academic Profession (Gil Antón, 1996).

[3] The surveys carried out in 1992 and 2002 included in their samples half- and part-time faculty. The 2007 and 2018, on the other hand, only considered full-time personnel, the group considered to be the core of the academic profession to the extent that it included those who could get involved in all tasks usually associated with academic work: teaching, research, service, and institutional participation (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). Pinto, Galaz Fontes and Padilla González (2012) have analysed methodologically the national faculty surveys prior to the 2018 one.

At the same time the above profile changes were taking place, the social origin and current households of academics had also changed in a significant manner. For example, the percentages of academics with at least one parent with higher education studies grew from 32.2% in 1992, to 47.0% in 2018. Also, among faculty under 40 years of age, the corresponding figures for 1992, 2002, 2007 and 2018 were, respectively, 31.5%, 34.9%, 47.9% and 65.6%, reflecting a strong dynamic mobility and socioeconomic replacement (see Table 1). Part of a social reproduction processes of a socio-labour sector (Esteve Palós, 2005; Rodríguez, 2016), the percentage of academics who reported that their partners had higher education studies increased from 70.8% in 2002, to 79.6% in 2007.[4]

In addition to the aforementioned aspects, work dynamics for full-time academics have been modified too during the period 1992 - 2018. While in 1992 the faculty surveyed reported, on average, dedicating 22.7 hours per week to teaching classes, by 2018 that figure decreased to 10.9 hours. At the same time, for the period 2002 - 2018, the hours per week dedicated to research increased, on average, from 6.3 to 9.7 hours (see Table 1).[5]

Associated with the mentioned shift in work priorities, a change in academic preferences has also taken place. Thus, while in 1992 59.2% of full-time academics surveyed by Gil Antón (1996) affirmed that they felt more inclined towards teaching (including a percentage that reported incorporating research activities in a secondary way), in 2018 such percentage had decreased to 40.6%. Reciprocally, the preference for research, either exclusively or combined with some teaching activity, increased from 40.8% in 1992, to 59.4% in 2018 (see Table 1).

We therefore observe that between 1992 and today the profile of full-time Mexican faculty, which in 2016 represented around one quarter of all academics (Mendoza Rojas, 2018), has been reconfigured. They have aged, become more feminine, gone through graduate studies, come increasingly from more educated families, have partners with a higher education level, are more involved in research then in teaching and, correspondingly, report a stronger preference for research than for teaching. All of this in just three decades (see Table 1) and, as will be argued in the next section, under the context of a set of public policies at the core of which has been the National Researchers' System.

The Emergence of the New Mexican Academic Meritocracy

Although briefly, the previous section showed that in the last three decades full-time Mexican academics have reconfigured themselves to mirror the "ideal international" faculty, i.e., highest possible degree (Ph.D.) obtained at a "world-class" university (Salmi, 2009), productive research activities and being member of international academic networks in their fields of study (Didou Aupetit & Gérard, 2010).

Beyond the "natural" processes expected from the expansion of a higher education system in a country with a developing economy like the one Mexico had until the 1970s, the growth that occurred in that decade has been interpreted as the result of a political exchange (or pact) between the State and middle-class sectors of society, in which access to higher education for those middle-sectors—a possibility of upward social mobility— provided legitimacy to the State (Fuentes Molinar, 1986). Such growth, however, supported by a very limited institutional and academic platform and in a particular political context, was disorganized and generated, among other effects, an institutional stratification characterized by highly differentiated quality levels in terms of infrastructure, educational programs, personnel, teaching, research, and service activities (Fuentes Molinar, 1989; Kent Serna, 1993).

Until the early 1980s, higher education institutions developed as "disorganized anarchies" (Ibarra Colado, 2010). At that time Mexico faced a financial crisis that led to a transformation in the relationship between the State and Society. In that context public higher education would be increasingly financed based on the evaluation of its performance (Mendoza Rojas, 2002). In the mist of budget cuts to public higher education and a salary containment that implied, due to inflation, a real-income reduction of more than 60% of faculty salaries (Ordorika Sacristán, 2004), the National Researchers' System was founded

[4] The corresponding question was not included in the 1992 and 2018 surveys.
[5] The 1992 survey did not consider a question regarding the number of hours per week involved in research activities.

(SNI from its initials in Spanish; Poder Ejecutivo Federal, 1994). SNI, originally conceived to alleviate to some extent the sharp income reduction of faculty doing research, was a product of six factors acting together: (i) the expansion of higher education, (ii) the economic crisis arising from the Mexican development model, (iii) a dysfunctional governance of the higher education system, (iv) the neoliberal globalization then in action, (v) a political context characterized by a quid-pro-quo dynamics and, very importantly, (vi) the existence of a group of faculty members with strong research and international disciplinary referents.

Just as the political pact between the State and the middle-classes that took place in the previous decade, the creation of the SNI expressed a new agreement, but now between the State and academic-researchers mainly from the natural and physical sciences, which happened to have close ties to the government (Soberón, 2015). Just like all higher education faculty working at that time, this group also suffered a very significant drop of income by 1982. However, unlike most academics, this group was in a position to directly communicate to the then Secretary of Public Education and through him, to the President of the country, the need and convenience of creating a "system of national researchers" to prevent the possibility of brain drain (Flores Valdez, 2012). Thus, appeared the seeds for financing policies that would later on target the hole of public higher education. Such policies would follow in what is known as the "modernization" stage (Kent Serna, 2009).

Originally addressed to a small group of researchers working in public higher education institutions, the underlying logic of SNI would soon extend, directly and indirectly, to every full-time faculty member in the country (Galaz Fontes & Estévez Nenninger, 2015). It would also touch other aspects of higher education (program accreditation, student admission processes, certification of administrative procedures, etc.) in order to, finally, structure a conditional cash transfer system aimed at faculty (Galaz Fontes & Gil Antón, 2013a) and, at the institutional level, a remuneration scheme based on performance (Mendoza Rojas, 2002).

Basically, the operation of SNI is based on (a) the establishment of criteria consistent with an international academic life (e.g. publication of articles in prestigious journals, citations to published works, obtaining funding for research projects, direction of graduate-level thesis, and others); (b) association of such criteria to a scale of positions or levels; (c) a collegiate evaluation of applicants, the vast majority of whom are full-time, by national committees; (d) a new member were admitted, he/she would be appointed national researcher and be given additional income, not assimilable to its contractual salary, depending on the level achieved, and (e) an evaluation process performed every several years that could result in moving up the ladder, but also in being expelled from the system (CONACYT, 2020).[6] Initially focused on the income dimension of academic work, SNI soon acquired, largely thanks to its operation centred on individual academic "merit," something that had an important symbolic value and developed an enormous capacity to modify the lives of faculty in general, and particularly those with an inclination towards research and/or towards the material and symbolic rewards associated with prestige.

In the first section of this text the global reconfiguration of the Mexican academic profession was briefly documented (Galaz Fontes & Gil Antón, 2009). However, these changes (and others) have not been homogeneous. There are significant variations with respect to their contract (full- versus non-full-time) and institutions in which faculty work, the disciplines they pursue, their gender and, in particular, in relation to whether their main activity is teaching or research. Indeed, it is SNI members those who have changed the most and, within this already select group (currently around 30% of full-time faculty), the subgroup located in the two upper levels of the SNI scale[7] is the one that most fully meets all of the "ideal" international academic criteria recognized by this system. If official statistics reported a total of 394,189 faculty members in 2019 (SEP, 2020), around 2-3% of them, those in SNI levels II and III,

[6] SNI by-rules are more complex and specific, but these are its central characteristics. Also, although not originally, in time the system would accept researchers working in private higher education institutions and in industry.

[7] SNI has five levels associated with different additional income and prestige: Candidate, Levels 1, II, III and Emeritus. By 2016 national researchers II, III and Emeritus represented about 23% of all SNI members (Rodríguez, 2016). Emeritus SNI members are retired national researchers.

constitute what can be called a Mexican academic elite which, because it is based on its work, is labelled here as meritocratic (Markovits, 2019; Sandel, 2020). How did this elite emerge? What consequences has it brought?

SNI, along with other merit-based payment programs, has had a considerable impact inducing faculty towards a Ph.D., to work and produce more in research and to teach at the graduate level (Galaz Fontes, Padilla González, Viloria Hernández, & Villa Chávez, 2014; Rubio Oca, 2006; Urbano Vidales, Aguilar Sahagún, & Rubio Oca, 2006). At the same time, however, several important negative collateral effects have been documented, i.e., promoting simulation, corruption, discouragement of academic participation in institutional governance, dismantling of the institutional academic career and, of utmost importance, it has discouraged teaching in a higher education system that is mainly oriented to professional training at the undergraduate level (Galaz Fontes et al., 2014; Galaz Fontes & Gil Antón, 2013b). On the other hand, given that working conditions vary from institution to institution, SNI has also impacted their stratification in terms of the working conditions that a given institution can provide so their faculty can perform a job that may lead them to be admitted to the system or to stay in it.

As a reflection of the SNI recognition and remuneration scheme, membership in SNI grew, relative to all full-time faculty surveyed, from 8.0% in 1992, to 30.7% in 2018 (13.8% in 2002, and 21.5% in 2007). Associated with this growing emphasis on scientific research work and knowledge production, there is also a difference regarding the time that faculty reported to be involved in different activities, consistent with the SNI reward system. Thus, while in 2007 non-SNI full-time faculty affirmed that they dedicated 23.3 and 7.4 hours per week to teaching and research activities, respectively, SNI academics reported for the same activities 15.2 and 20.3 hours per week.

Associated to the above-mentioned changes, SNI also seems to have a strong impact on its members' academic preferences. While SNI members reported very high levels of preference towards research both in 2007 and 2018 (91.7% and 91.5%, respectively), only 32.8% of non-SNI academics surveyed in 2007 reported leaning towards research (67.8% towards teaching), increasing to 45.0% in 2018 (55.0% towards teaching). This change in academic preference amongst non-SNI scholars indicates the powerful attraction that the research recognized and rewarded by SNI represents.

Another evidence of the impact of SNI in Mexican full-time faculty is the fact that evaluation criteria for researchers in the areas of natural sciences and mathematics is in accordance with their working and production conditions and expected disciplinary trajectories, while the criteria used for social sciences are adaptations of the former. In this way, while criteria for mathematics and natural sciences constitute a kind of a photograph of the way in which its members work, they have served as a model for those in use in the social sciences area, in a process of disciplinary isomorphism (Gil Antón & Contreras Gómez, 2017).

On the other hand, given that SNI has been implemented in the context of a higher education system that has expanded and, at the same time, diversified and stratified, there has also been an unequal distribution of SNI members in different types of higher education institutions. For instance, in 2007 SNI academics were over-represented, when compared to the percentage of faculty working in them, in public research centres (6.7% of the national total of academics and 27.4% of the national total researchers) and in federal public institutions (22.8% of the national total academics and 31.1% of national total researchers). However, they were under-represented in public state institutions (42.0% and 30.9%, respectively), public technological institutions (15.1% and 3.8%, respectively) and elite private institutions (13.4% and 6.8%, respectively). While over-representation at public research centres is consistent with their explicit institutional mission, such is not the case with the over- or under-representation of SNI academics in the other types of higher education institutions.

Finally, regarding the international dimension of the academic body, Didou Aupetit and Gérard (2010) have documented, with 2009 data from SNI, that top-level membership has been associated with completing a Ph.D. in a foreign country or, alternatively, in a prestigious national institution. Along these lines, Galaz Fontes (2010) reports, for 2007, that among faculty who reported being SNI members,

47.0% obtained their highest degree in Mexico, while the remaining 53.0% did so in another country. Also, for that year, Galaz Fontes and colleagues (2012) point out that, while among non SNI faculty 23.9% of those who report doing research also say that they collaborate with international colleagues, the corresponding percentage for SNI members is 63.3%.

Summarizing, in the context of a performance-based public funding scheme for higher education, SNI has had an important impact on all Mexican faculty through a small percentage of those who hold a full-time position (around 8% if we consider all members of the SNI, and 2-3% if we only include levels II, III and Emeritus). SNI has also contributed to the reconfiguration of its a socio-demographic and academic profile; it has modified their work and their perception of it. Likewise, it has encouraged faculty to focus more and more on research activities that lead to products recognized in international circuits of journals and publications and, at the same time, it is push institutions to hire, for their full-time openings, academics that are in the direction of entering the SNI, as that brings more public budget and prestige form them. Thus, a new and contemporary academic meritocracy associated with the upper SNI levels has emerged that was not present three decades ago.

The Perspective of the New Mexican Academic Meritocracy

It has been commented that the political pact between the federal government and research- oriented faculty, reflected in the creation of SNI in 1984, was broadened and deepened in the following decades, and today, thanks to a network of programs consistent with such pact, the logic of the SNI system has been internalized by a vast majority of young people with academic and/or research aspirations as the only model of personal and professional development. For them, their perspective for development is set in climbing the SNI ladder, regardless of the institution in which they work, not paying appropriate attention to the profiles of the students they attend nor the discipline they cultivate. Start as candidate and do what is necessary to get to Level I and then to Level II, then keep going up to Level III and, finally, become an Emeritus National Researcher. Although entering the system is a highly rewarded event, remaining in it, and particularly not being able to do so, can be more than personally traumatic (Camarillo Hinojoza at al., 2020), but these are the costs of the meritocratic dynamic for its followers (Markovits, 2019).

Regardless of the institutional uprooting that it promotes or the exclusion of broad sectors of colleagues and co-workers (Suárez Zozaya & Muñoz García, 2016), it is assumed that progress along the SNI categories implies a contribution to the training of competent and socially responsible professionals and, at the same time, that solutions to national problems are provided by way of their research. However, even though indexed publications of Mexican authors have increased (CONACYT, 2017), national economic development and general well-being of the population seem not to have been very affected by such scholarly production. But neither this nor the documentation of negative collateral effects seem to bother much the adherents of this scheme (Alvarez Mendiola, 2010; Esteinou Madrid, 2013; Galaz Fontes & Gil Antón, 2013b).

The disorderly expansion of higher education contributed to the emergence of quality-differentiated sectors among higher education institutions (Kent Serna, 1993). Similarly, the pact formalized in SNI has generated a stratification of the academic body. While most faculty employees in Mexico do not have job stability or appropriate conditions to carry out their work, and are subject to a non-stop flow of public policies whose objective seems to be the improvement of a "paper university," as Porter (2003) acutely expressed more than 15 years ago, a small percentage of academics is part of the global academic community thanks to their publications in journals and editorials of international quality, always under the hegemonic pattern of U.S. research universities, a scheme that is often divorced from the real needs of the countries that follow this model (Marginson & Ordorika, 2011).

During the last three decades programs such as SNI have been transformed and sophisticated, but they have kept their orientation and reinforced a discourse characterized by the use of terms such as *evaluation*, *accountability*, *quality*, *excellence*, *performance-based funding*, *accreditation*, *competitiveness*, *entrepreneurship*, *labour market*, *globalization*, *internationalization*, *human capital* and, particularly, *merit*. These concepts are systematically used by politicians, education authorities,

institutional officials, faculty, and even students. With them, a new "common sense" (Alcántara, Llomovate, & Romão, 2013), in which the notion of "meritocracy" is central, has taken root around the functions, actors and dynamics of higher education and its relationship with society.

The new meritocratic common sense and its associated practices have brought with its innumerable effects on the conformation, structure, organization and functioning of Mexican higher education. Thus, on the one hand, it gives privilege to training designed for a labour market that does not take into account non-commercialized social needs -as in the case of training of public health professionals- and, on the other hand, it makes civic formation non-existent, solidarity invisible and diminishes the helping capacity of students and faculty in a country that requires complete participation just to follow through. As a case in sample, in scientific research, publishing in international journals is frequently confused with helping generate real solutions to national problems. In other cases, the research being done deals more with the agenda of researchers from universities in the "central" countries rather with the immediate problems in an institution's community. All of this contributes to keeping our scientific and technological development, albeit of quality, still "peripheral" to the extent it depends on the hegemonic academic centres of the world (Arocena & Sutz, 2001).

Public higher education, its central actors and its dynamics have been commercialized in the sense that its operation has tended to incorporate the logic of the market and, in congruence with this, nobody sees it as a public space where rights and the common good should prevail, but as markets where essentially competition and profit recognize individual merit (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). On the other hand, by accepting that academic normality in Mexican higher education institutions should be the same as that observed in developed countries, they more than willing to compete to improve their standing in university "rankings", setting aside any question that might suggest that having "world-class universities" could be, at the same time, locally dysfunctional (Ordorika Sacristán et al., 2008).

SNI, together with other similar financing schemes, has contributed to generating a "aristocratic academic meritocracy" that, following Markovitz (2019), we could characterize in terms of a high educational qualification (they have completed a Ph.D. in an international institution or in a prestigious national one), they focus on research and are part of the top SNI levels, they participate in international academic networks, they are very hard-working and see individual evaluation as the natural way to properly assign resources and prestige, although they do not necessarily agree with the quantitative instruments currently in use (Buendía Espinosa et al., 2017). This academic elite has endorsed the meritocratic principles and considers that the bonuses and the recognition they receive are fully justified and do not represent any concession from the State (Young, 1961); they assume that just as they now have favourable conditions, anyone can obtain them if they execute hard-enough work. Finally, they consider that their work is essential for the development of higher education and the country.

In short, we have lived under material conditions and practices that have promoted the development of an individualistic "meritocratic common sense" and, to that extent, those of us who participate in public higher education (academics, students, workers, and authorities), have been, for all practical purpose, ideologically colonized (Galaz Fontes & Martínez Stack, 2020; Markovits, 2019). One consequence of this is the assumption that higher education and scientific research are absolutely neutral, and that the only thing that matters is that they keep their quality or excellence. Likewise, there is a tendency to think that, given such neutrality, higher education and scientific research are not, and should not be, closely associated with a national project. With all that is happening today, the real question is whether it makes sense that this ideology and its devices continue to function in the new times that are looming on the horizon, or if it does not.

Final Reflection and Proposal

In the context of the aforementioned, one of the challenges facing Mexican faculty, especially full-time and SNI members -and even more so the new academic aristocracy- is to critically question the meritocratic ideology to which they have been subjected during the last decades and begin to participate in the construction of a new perspective on the concept of merit. What alternatives can be considered

for a less meritocratic-excluding development of the Mexican academic profession in the face of this state of affairs?

Based on the existing literature and on the antecedent reflections, the central proposal of this work is to take the meritocratic ethos and structure of the academic career immersed in SNI, and to transfer it to all higher education institutions where academics work. In other words, it is about building a horizontal meritocratic-inclusive alternative, one that would foster collaboration and solidarity, and would make institutional and individual isomorphism unnecessary. For countries not in the centre of the academic world it is important to build an alternative to their peripheral status in it, and this could be part of it.

The approach has several important implications. First, advancement in an academic career should depend on the faculty members' contributions, both individual and collectively, in support of the mission of the institutions where they work. Secondly, the academic career must expand in such a way that recognition and remuneration may be associated with research activities, but also with teaching and/or extension/outreach activities (Boyer, 1990). Third, additional remuneration based on short-term evaluations must be minimized and, instead, adequate income must be allocated to each of the categories that different work paths may assume. Fourth, it is important that the academic career should not be a sprint, but rather that it should have a temporal/periodical perspective in tune with the nature of the work being done. Finally, the decision-making process regarding faculty admission, promotion and retirement must result from a collegiate process in which academics assume, far from one of submission (Galaz Fontes et al., 2011; Gil Antón, 2000), a central role vis-à-vis the corresponding authorities.

Today we observe the strong presence and influence of an academic meritocracy that is positioned at the top of a stratified academic profession. Faced with this situation, the previous proposal also implies that all academics should make an effort to transform such segmented and stratified profession, into a "unitary" profession whose existence reaches beyond the institutions where they work, a given type of contract, and the main activity they develop. There are interest groups (institutional and government authorities, political groups, unions, think-tanks, etc.) that must be considered and understood because they compete for control, resources and the platform that constitutes higher education (Acosta Silva, 2015; Ordorika & Lloyd, 2014), and all this should be taken into account in a transition project. However, it is essential to recognize that maintaining a pyramid that converges in a sector that oscillates between 2% and 8% of a community of almost 400,000 members (SEP, 2020), is not sustainable.

Rather than making proposals that only take into account SNI members (e.g., Bensusán & Valenti, 2018), it is time to seek, with solidarity, coordination and bearing in mind the diversity that characterizes the Mexican academic profession, alternatives to better face the challenges that the current national situation presents to higher education, before the socio-economic and national political reality imposes conditions that could be counterproductive to everyone. Efforts in this regard demand that national academic elites assume themselves as part of a broader community that goes well beyond their institutions, in which not only their "meritorious" work is relevant to achieve the goals of Mexican higher education as a whole.

Acknowledgement

This work is based on a presentation made by the first author at the Center for Sociological Studies Internal Seminar "Higher Education in México." Mexico City: El Colegio de Mexico, October 28, 2020. We thank Jesús F. Galaz-Duarte in the translation of the text from Spanish into English. We also thank two anonymous reviewers who helped round up our arguments.

References

Acosta Silva, A. (2015). ANUIES: La política y las políticas [ANUIES: Politics and policies]. In G. Alvarez Mendiola (Ed.), *La ANUIES y la construcción de políticas de educación superior 1950-2015* [*ANUIES and the building of higher education policies, 1950-2015*] (pp. 47-71). México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Alcántara, A., Llomovate, S., & Romão, J. E. (2013). Resisting neoliberal common sense in higher education: Experiences from Latin America. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 23*(2), 127-151.

Alvarez Mendiola, G., Cházaro, L., de Ibarrola, M., Didou, S., Maldonado, A., Paradise, R., Remedi, E., & Weiss, E. (2010). *Los efectos indeseados del SNI y la necesidad de su transformación* [*The unwanted effects of SNI and the need of its transformation*]. Ponencia presentada en el I Congreso de los Miembros del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores, 5-8 May, Querétaro, Mexico.

Arocena, R., & Sutz, J. (2001). Changing knowledge production and Latin American universities. *Research Policy, 30*, 1221-1234.

Balbachevsky, E. (2016). Academically excellent, but deaf to society's needs. *University World News Global Edition, 398*. Access: https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20160126134110710.

Bensusán, G., & Valenti, G. (Eds.) (2018). *La evaluación de los académicos: Instituciones y Sistema Nacional de Investigadores, aciertos y controversias* [*Faculty evaluation: Institutions and National Researchers System, successes and controversies*]. México: FLACSO México y UAM.

Bowen, H. R. & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Buendía Espinosa, A., García Salord, S., Grediaga, R., Landesman, M., Rodríguez Gómez, R., Rondero, N., Rueda, M., & Vera, H. (2017). Queríamos evaluar y terminamos contando: Alternativas para la valoración del trabajo académico [We wanted to evaluate and ended-up counting: Alternatives for evaluating academic work]. *Perfiles Educativos, 39*(157), 200-219.

Camarillo Hinojoza, H. M., Vázquez Martínez, A. E., Ramírez Gómez, A. E., & Barboza Regalado, C. D. (2020). La pérdida de la membresía del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores: Halllazgos de investigación [Loss of membership in the national system of researchers: Research findings]. *Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas, 28*(178), https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.4997

Cantwell, B., & Maldonado-Maldonado, A. (2009). Four stories: Confronting contemporary ideas about globalisation and internationalisation in higher education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 7*(3), 289-306.

Casillas Alvarado, M. A., & de Garay Sánchez, A. (1992). El contexto de la constitución del cuerpo académico en la educación superior, 1960-1990 [The context of the constitution of the academic body]. In M. Gil Antón, A. de Garay Sánchez, R. Grediaga Kuri, L. Pérez Franco, M. A. Casillas Alvarado, & N. Rondero López (Eds.), *Académicos: Un botón de muestra* [*Academics: A sample button*] (pp. 11-60). México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Azcapotzalco.

Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología. (2017). *General Report of the state of science, techonology and innovation Mexico 2017*. Access: https://www.siicyt.gob.mx/index.php/transparencia/informes-conacyt/informe-general-del-estado-de-la-ciencia-tecnologia-e-innovacion/informe-general-2017/4826-informe-general-2017-version-en-ingles/file

Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología. (2020). *Padrón de beneficiarios del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores* [*Census of beneficiaries of the National Researchers System*]. Access: http://www.conacyt.gob.mx/images/SNI/Vigentes_2020.xlsx.

Didou Aupetit, S., & Gérard, E. (2010). *El Sistema Nacional de Investigadores, veinticinco años después: La comunidad científica, entre distinción e internacionalización*. [*The National Researchers System, twenty five years after: The scientific community, between distinction and internationalization*]. México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Escalante Gonzalbo, F. (2015). *Historia mínima de el neoliberalismo*. [*A short history of neoliberalism*]. México: El Colegio de México y EditorialTurner.

Esteinou Madrid, J. (2013). Refundar el Sistema Nacional de Investigadores: Propuestas [Refounding the National Researchers System]. *Este País: Tendencias y opiniones, 269*, 26-32.

Esteve Palós, A. (2005). Tendencias en homogamia educacional en México: 1970-2000 [Trends in educational homogamy in Mexico: 1970-2000]. *Estudios Demográficos y Urbanos*, *20*(2), 341-362.

Estévez-Nenninger, E. H, González-Bello, E. O., Valdés-Cuervo, A., Arcos-Vega, J. L., Ramiro-Marentes, F., & Gutiérrez-Franco, L. E. (2020). Teaching and research of academics in Mexico: Preferences and dedication according to the international survey APIKS. *Higher Education Forum, 17*, 99-114.

Flores Valdés, J. (2012). Los orígenes del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores [The origins of the National Researchers System]. In S. Vega y León (Ed.), *Sistema Nacional de Investigadores: Retos y perspectivas de la ciencia en México* [*The National Researchers System: Challenges and perspectives of science in Mexico*] (pp. 11-19). México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana Xochimilco.

Fuentes Molinar, O. (1986). Crecimiento y diferenciación del sistema universitario: El caso de México [Growth and differentiation of the university system: The case of Mexico]. *Crítica, 26/27*, 5-16.

Fuentes Molinar, O. (1989). La educación superior en México y los escenarios de su desarrollo futuro [Higher education in Mexico and the scenarios of its future development]. *Universidad Futura, 1*(3), 2-11.

Galaz Fontes, J. F. (2010). *El académico mexicano miembro del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores: Una exploración inicial de su trayectoria profesional* [*The Mexican academic member of the National Researchers System: An initial exploration of its professional trajectory*]. *I Congreso de los Miembros del Sistema Nacional de Investigadores*., 5-8 May, Querétaro, Mexico.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., & Estévez Nenninger, E. H. (2015). La ANUIES y la profesión académica mexicana: Entre el discurso y la acción institucional [ANUIES and the Mexican academic profession: Between discourse and institutional action]. In G. Alvarez Mendiola (Ed.), *La ANUIES y la construcción de políticas de educación superior, 1950-2015* [*ANUIES and the building of higher education policies, 1950-2015*] (pp. 349-367). México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., & Gil Antón, M. (2009). La profesión académica en México: Un oficio en proceo de reconfiguración [The academic profession in Mexico: A trade in a reconfiguration process]. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa*, *11*(2), 1-31.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., & Gil Antón, M. (2013a). The impact of merit-pay systems on the work and attitudes of Mexican academics. *Higher Education, 66*(3), 357-374.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., & Gil Antón, M. (2013b). Evaluación y programas de incentivos para los académicos mexicanos: ¿De los ingresos adicionales a la adicción al dinero? [Evaluation and incentive programs for Mexican academics: From additional income to money addiction?]. *Avance y Perspectiva, Nueva Epoca, 5*(2). Access: http://avanceyperspectiva.cinvestav.mx/3683/evaluacion-y-programas-de-incentivos-para-los-academicos-mexicanos-de-los-ingresos-adicionales-a-la-adiccion-al-dinero

Galaz Fontes, J. F., Gil Antón, M., Padilla González, L. E., Sevilla García, J. J., Arcos Vega, J. L., & Martínez Stack, J. (Eds.) (2012). *La reconfiguración de la profesión académica en México* [*The reconfiguration of the academic profession in Mexico*]. Culiacán, Sinaloa: Universidad Autónoma de Sinaloa y Universidad Autónoma de Baja California.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., & Martínez Stack, J. (2020). La colonización ideológica de la educación superior pública mexicana [The ideological colonization of public Mexican Higher Education]. *Educación Futura*. Access: https://www.educacionfutura.org/la-colonizacion-ideologica-de-la-educacion-superior-publica-mexicana/

Galaz-Fontes, J. F., Martínez-Stack, J., Estévez-Nénninger, E. H., Padilla-González, L. E., Gil-Antón, M., Sevilla-García, J. J., & Arcos-Vega, J. L. (2014). The divergent worlds of teaching and research among Mexican faculty: Tendencies and implications. In J. C. Shin, A. Arimoto, W. K. Cummings, & U. Teichler (Eds.),

Teaching and research in contemporary higher education: Systems, activities and rewards (pp. 199-220). Dordrecht: Springer.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., Padilla González, L. E., Viloria Hernández, E., & Villa Chávez, A. (2014). *El personal académico universitario: Una exploración inicial desde la base de datos ExECUM*. [*University academic personnel: An initial exploration using the ExECUM data base*]. México: Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional, UNAM.

Galaz Fontes, J. F., Sevilla García, J. J., Padilla González, L. E., Arcos Vega, J. L., Gil Antón, M., & Martínez Stack, J. (2011). Mexico: A portrait of a managed profession. In W. Locke, W. K. Cummings, & D. Fisher (Eds.), *Changing governance and management in higher education* (pp. 57-82). Dordrecht: Springer.

Gil Antón, M. (1996). The Mexican academic profession. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries* (pp. 305-337). Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Gil Antón, M. (2000). Los académicos en los noventa: ¿Actores, sujetos, espectadores o rehenes? [Faculty during the nineties: Actors, subjects, expectators or hostages?]. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Educativa, 2*(1), 1-7.

Gil Antón, M., & Contreras Gómez, L. E. (2017). El Sistema Nacional de Investigadores: ¿Espejo y modelo? [The National Researchers System: Mirror and model?]. *Revista de la Educación Superior, 46*(184), 1-19.

Gil Antón, M., De Garay Sánchez, A., Grediaga Kuri, G., Pérez Franco, L., Casillas Alvarado, M. A., & Rondero López, N. (1992). *Académicos: Un botón de muestra* [*Academics: A sample button*]. México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Azcapotzalco.

Gil Antón, M., Grediaga Kuri, R., Pérez Franco, L., Rondero López, N., Casillas Alvarado, M. A., de Garay Sánchez, A., … & Hernández Jimate, E. L. (1994). *Los rasgos de la diversidad: Un estudio sobre los académicos Mexicanos* [*The traits of diversity: A study of Mexican academics*]. México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Unidad Azcapotzalco.

Grediaga Kuri, R., Rodríguez Jiménez, J. R. & Padilla González, L. E. (2004). *Políticas públicas y cambios en la profesión académica en México en la última década* [*Public policies and changes in the academic profession in Mexico during the last decade*]. México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Ibarra Colado, E. (2010). Exigencias de organización y de gestión de las universidades públicas mexicanas: De su pasado político a sus mercados presentes [Demands of organization and management of Mexican public universities: From their political past to their current markets]. In D. Cazés, E. Ibarra, & L. Porter (Eds.), *Las universidades públicas mexicanas en el año 2030: Examinando presentes, imaginando futuros* [*Mexican public universities in the year 2030: Examining presents, imagining futures*] (pp. 55-92). México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana y Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Kent Serna, R. (1986a). ¿Quiénes son los profesores universitarios? Las vicisitudes de una azarosa profesionalización [Who are the university professors? The vicissitudes of an aleatory professionalization]. In R. Kent Serna (Ed.), *Ciclos y avatares de la educación superior en México: Antología personal* [*Cycles and avatars of higher education in Mexico: A personal anthology*] (pp. 53 76). México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Kent Serna, R. (1986b). Los profesores y la crisis universitaria [Professors and the university crisis]. *Cuadernos Políticos, 46*, 41-54.

Kent Serna, R. (1993). El desarrollo de políticas en educación superior en México, 1960-1990 [The evolution of higher education policies in Mexico, 1960-1990]. In H. Courard (Ed.), *Políticas comparadas de educación superior en América Latina* [*Comparative higher education policies in Latin America*] (pp. 341-396). Santiago de Chile: Flacso-Chile.

Kent Serna, R. (2009). La economía política de la educación superior durante la modernización [Political economy of higher education during modernization]. In R. Kent Serna (Ed.), *Las políticas de educación superior en*

México durante la modernización [*Higher education policies in Mexico during modernization*] (pp. 39-91). México: Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior.

Markovits, D. (2019). *The meritocracy trap*. London: Penguin Random House.

Marginson, S., & Ordorika, I. (2011). *Hegemonía en la era del conocimiento: Competencia global en la educación superior y la investigación* [*Hegemony in the knowledge era: Global competition in higher education and research*]. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Mendoza Rojas, J. (2002). *Transición de la educación superior contemporánea en México: De la planeación al estado evaluador* [*Contemporary higher education transition in Mexico*]. México: UNAM-Porrúa.

Mendoza Rojas, J. (2018). *Subsistemas de educación superior: Estadística básica 2006-2017*. [*Higher education subsystems: Basic statistics, 2006-2017*]. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Ordorika Sacristán, I. (2004). El mercado de la academia [The academic market]. In I. Ordorika (Ed.), *La academia en jaque: Perspectivas políticas sobre la evaluación de la educación superior en México* [*Academe on check: Political perspectives on the evaluation of higher education in Mexico*] (pp. 35-74). México: UNAM-Porrúa.

Ordorika Sacristán, I., Rodríguez Gómez, R., Alcántara Santuario, A., Canales Sánchez, A., López Martínez, P., Lozano Espinosa, F. J., Márquez Jiménez, A., & Martínez Stack, J. (2008). *Comentarios al Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008*. [*Comments on the Academic Ranking of World Universities 2008*]. México: UNAM, Dirección General de Evaluación Institucional.

Ordorika, I., & Lloyd, M. (2013). A decade of international university rankings: A critical perspective from Latin America. In P. T. M. Marope, P. J. Wells, & E. Hazelkorn (Eds.), *Rankings and accountability in higher education* (pp. 209-231). Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Ordorika, I., & Lloyd, M. (2014). Teorías críticas del Estado y la disputa por la educación superior en la era de la globalización [Critical theories of the State and the dispute for higher education in the globalization era]. *Perfiles Educativos, 36*(145), 122-139.

Padilla González, L. E. (2007). La socialización del personal académico: Fortaleciendo la profesión académica en México [The socialization of academic personnel: Strengthening the academic profession in Mexico]. *Revista de la Educación Superior, 36*(2), 87-100.

Poder Ejecutivo Federal (1984). *Acuerdo por el que se establece el Sistema Nacional de Investigadores* [*Decree by which the National Researchers System is created*]. México: Diario Oficial de la Federación.

Porter, L. (2003). *La universidad de papel: Ensayos sobre la educación superior en México* [*The paper university: Essays on higher education in Mexico*]. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Rama, C. (2009). La tendencia a la masificación de la cobertura de la educación superior en América Latina [The trend towards higher education massification in Latin America]. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación, 50*, 173-195.

Rodríguez, C. E. (2016). *El Sistema Nacional de Investigadores en números* [*The National Researchers System in numbers*]. México: Foro Consultivo Científico y Tecnológico.

Rodríguez, S. E. (2016). Selección de parejas y estratificación social: Hacia una agenda de investigación [Assortative mating and social stratification: Towards a research program]. *Estudios Sociológicos, 34*(100), 169-190.

Rubio Oca, J. (2006). *La política educativa y la educación superior en México 1995-2006: Un balance* [*Educational policy and higher education in Mexico 1995-2006: A balance*]. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública y Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Salmi, J. (2009). *El desafío de crear universidades de rango mundial* [*The challenge of establishing world-class universities*]. Washington, DC: El Banco Mundial.

Sandel, M. J. (2020). *The tyranny of merit: What's become of the common good?* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Secretaría de Educación Pública (2020). *Principales cifras del sistema educativo nacional, 2019-2020* [*Main figures of the national education system, 2019-2020*]. México: Secretaría de Educatión Pública.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Soberón, G. (2015). *El médico, el rector* [*The physician, the rector*]. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Suárez Zozaya, M. H., & Muñoz García, H. (2016). ¿Qué pasa con los académicos? [What's happening with academics?]. *Revista de la Educació Superior*, *45*(4), 1-22.

Teichler, U. (2009). *Sistemas comparados de educación superior en Europa: Marcos conceptuales, resultados empíricos y perspectiva de futuro* [*Comparative systems of higher education in Europe: Conceptual frameworks, empirical results and future perspective*]. Barcelona: Octaedro.

Trow, M. (1973). *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*. New York, NY: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Urbano Vidales, G., Aguilar Sahagún, G., & Rubio Oca, J. (2006). *Programa de Mejoramiento del Profesorado: Un primer análisis de su operación e impactos en el proceso de fortalecimiento académico de las universidades públicas* [*Program for the Improvement of the Professoriate: A first analysis of its operation and impacts in the process of academic strengthening of public universities*]. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública.

Young, M. (1961). *The rise of the meritocracy, 1870-2033: An essay on education and equality*. Bristol: Penguin Books.