



# The Commodification of Knowledge and the Devaluation of Humanities Scholarship: A Threat to Intellectual Freedom and Diversity

Sunday Olaoluwa Dada

*Department of Philosophy, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*

## KEYWORDS:

Humanities, Commodification of knowledge, Intellectual freedom, Critical thinking, Diversity

## WORD COUNT:

185

## CORRESPONDING EMAIL ADDRESS:

sunday.dada@eksu.edu.ng

## ORCID NUMBER:

0000-0001-7093-0535

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines how the commodification of knowledge, driven by neoliberal policies and market-oriented values, poses a significant threat to intellectual freedom and diversity in higher education and society. The thesis argues that the commodification process has led to the devaluation of humanities scholarship, narrowing intellectual inquiry, diminishing critical thinking skills, and eroding cultural literacy. Despite extensive research on the commodification of knowledge and its impact on higher education, there remains a gap in understanding the specific consequences for humanities scholarship and its implications for intellectual freedom and diversity. This study aims to address this gap by investigating how the commodification of knowledge has contributed to the devaluation of humanities disciplines and exploring the broader consequences for intellectual freedom and diversity. The significance of this study lies in its contribution to comprehending the intricate relationship between knowledge commodification and the humanities. Furthermore, it provides valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and scholars who are committed to preserving intellectual freedom and diversity amidst these evolving challenges. Through this investigation, the study seeks to highlight the importance of humanities scholarship in fostering a diverse and intellectually free society.

## HOW TO CITE

Dada S.O. (2024). The Commodification of Knowledge and the Devaluation of Humanities Scholarship: A Threat to Intellectual Freedom and Diversity. *Educational Perspectives*, 13(1), 59-71.

## **Introduction**

Higher education systems around the world have witnessed considerable transformations in recent decades, with a focus on market-oriented paradigms. This transition has resulted in the commodification of knowledge, in which knowledge is seen as a marketable product susceptible to supply and demand pressures, rather than a public good intended for societal intellectual and cultural growth. In this setting, the humanities have suffered a significant devaluation. The thinking within the neoliberal sphere is that the humanities are less economically viable compared to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines. The prevailing belief is that STEM fields are directly linked to technological innovation and economic growth, thereby meriting greater institutional and financial support. This perception has led to a significant reallocation of resources within academic institutions, often resulting in reduced funding, diminished program offerings, and even the closure of humanities departments (Nussbaum, 2010).

The resultant effect of the commodification of knowledge is the devaluation of humanities scholarship. This raises critical concerns about the broader implications for intellectual freedom and diversity. Humanities disciplines play a crucial role in fostering critical thinking, ethical reasoning, cultural awareness, and an understanding of historical contexts—skills that are indispensable for the development of informed, reflective, and engaged citizens. The marginalization of these fields threatens to narrow the intellectual landscape, undermining the capacity of societies to address complex social, political, and ethical issues effectively. Also, the commodification of knowledge poses a direct threat to intellectual freedom. When academic priorities are dictated by market logic and funding sources are tied to corporate interests, scholars may feel pressured to align their research with economically lucrative outcomes rather than pursue intellectually challenging or controversial topics (Giroux, 2014).

This dynamic can lead to self-censorship, reducing the scope of academic inquiry and stifling creativity. The current trajectory of higher education, characterized by the commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of humanities scholarship, necessitates a critical examination of the underlying assumptions and values driving these trends. It is imperative to recognize the intrinsic value of humanities scholarship and advocate for a more balanced and inclusive approach to knowledge production that values all forms of intellectual inquiry.

This paper aims to explore the commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of humanities scholarship in depth, examining the historical and contemporary factors that have contributed to these trends. It will analyse the impact of these developments on intellectual freedom and diversity, drawing on a range of theoretical perspectives and empirical evidence. Furthermore, the paper will argue for the continued relevance and necessity of humanities scholarship in preserving intellectual diversity and fostering a critically engaged society. Through this comprehensive analysis, the essay seeks to highlight the urgent need for a reevaluation of the humanities within the broader academic and societal landscape.

## **The Commodification of Knowledge**

The commodification of knowledge represents a significant paradigm shift in the realm of higher education, one that redefines the very purpose and value of academic pursuits. This process is characterized by the treatment of knowledge as a commodity—a product that can be bought, sold, and traded within the market. This phenomenon is reflected, according to Omar, “in policy discourse, curriculum design and societal expectations” (2023). Driven primarily by neoliberal economic policies, this shift prioritizes market efficiency, profitability, and competitiveness over the intrinsic values traditionally associated with education, such as intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, and the pursuit of truth (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Talking about neoliberal policies Giroux writes that

..... neoliberal policies have resulted in an economic Darwinism that promotes privatization, commodification, free trade, and deregulation. It privileges personal responsibility over larger social forces, reinforces the gap between the rich and poor by redistributing wealth to the most powerful and wealthy individuals and groups, and it fosters a mode of public pedagogy that privileges the entrepreneurial subject while encouraging a value system that promotes self-interest, if not an unchecked selfishness. (2014, 1 )

By implication, therefore, according to Nenic, “The logic of capital has entered the contemporary field of education, changing the concept of knowledge from “an organized body of information” to “informational commodity” (2009).

Central to this transformation is the restructuring of academic institutions to better align with market logic. Universities, which once served as bastions of independent thinking and cultural enrichment, are now increasingly influenced by the principles of the market economy. This influence manifests itself in a variety of ways, including prioritizing research that promises immediate economic benefits, cultivating partnerships with the private sector, and actively seeking external funding from government and business sources. The consequence is a significant shift in academic priorities, with disciplines and research projects that align with market interests being favoured over those that do not. Another consequence is that it has led to high competition between higher education institutions resulting, according to Marginso, in

competition for status and resources in research and scholarship; competition between institutions to attract students; competition between students to gain the most sought-after places in institutions; competition in international student market and for corporate-financed consultancy work; and the often compelling contest between institutional ‘brands’ for ranking and prestige (2013, 357).

This is not to imply that there was no competition amongst higher education institutions before marketisation. There was certainly one, but it was centred on reputation and status inside the league table, rather than resources (Wilkinson and Wilkinson, 2020). Factors driving this competition were faculty quality, research productivity, academic programmes, and contributions to knowledge and society. Reputation and status were important, and institutions sought to improve their place in league tables and rankings, which frequently reflected academic eminence and intellectual accomplishments.

The market-driven approach's most evident effect is the disproportionate funding and resource allocation to STEM fields. The explanation for this is straightforward: the advancement of technology, the expansion of industry, and consequently the prosperity of the economy are closely linked to fields like science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Because of this connection, they are more appealing to funding organizations—public and private—who are more and more looking to sponsor studies that have immediate, observable economic advantages. This disparity in funding not only distorts the direction of academic research but also reinforces a utilitarian view of education. From this perspective, the value of knowledge is measured primarily by its potential for economic

application and return on investment. Such a view fundamentally undervalues sectors that do not directly contribute to economic growth, regardless of their broader social and cultural importance. As a result, the humanities, which often deal with abstract concepts and critical reflection on human experience, are increasingly seen as less useful, or even useless, in educational contexts.

The commercialization and marketisation of knowledge also have profound implications for the nature of academic work. Pressure to produce marketable research results can lead to a narrowing of the scope of scientific research, with topics that do not promise immediate financial returns being abandoned. This trend is exacerbated by increasing reliance on corporate funding, which can create conflicts of interest and compromise academic independence. Researchers may avoid pursuing controversial or innovative research that could jeopardize their funding sources, thus leading to a form of intellectual self-censorship (Giroux, 2014). Furthermore, the emphasis on marketable knowledge can lead to the erosion of academic standards and the commercialization of education. Universities may prioritize programmes and courses that attract students with high salaries or lucrative contracts, sometimes at the expense of quality and academic rigour. This process of commercialization is evident in the proliferation of professional programmes designed to meet market needs, often at the expense of traditional liberal arts education.

### **Historical Context of the Commodification of Knowledge**

To fully understand the commodification of knowledge, it's essential to examine its historical context. This phenomenon dates back to the post-World War II era when the relationship between higher education and the state evolved significantly. During the 1950s and 1960s, higher education systems expanded across many Western countries, driven by the belief that education was a public good contributing to social and economic

development. Governments invested heavily in universities, promoting access to higher education and supporting a wide range of academic disciplines (Trow, 1974). However, the economic crises of the 1970s and the rise of neoliberal ideologies in the 1980s marked a turning point. Faced with budgetary constraints, governments began adopting policies emphasizing efficiency, privatization, and market-based approaches to managing public institutions, including universities. The shift towards neoliberalism redefined higher education, increasingly framing it as a sector operating according to market principles and contributing directly to economic competitiveness (Harvey, 2005). This period saw the emergence of "academic capitalism," where universities and faculty engaged in market-like behaviours, such as seeking external funding and commercializing research outputs (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997).

While this shift presents some financial advantages, it raises several critical concerns. One fundamental issue with academic capitalism is its potential to erode academic freedom. When universities prioritize market demands, the scope of research becomes constrained, potentially sidelining projects driven by curiosity or societal needs lacking immediate commercial appeal. This can stifle innovation in non-lucrative fields. Moreover, the commodification of education treats education as a product rather than a public good, leading to higher tuition fees and increased student debt as institutions strive to enhance revenue streams. Academic capitalism can also exacerbate inequalities within the higher education sector. Wealthier institutions, with their established industry connections, are better positioned to capitalize on external funding opportunities, widening the gap between well-funded and underfunded universities. This disparity affects student access, limiting opportunities for those from less privileged backgrounds and undermining equitable education. The prioritization of research with immediate commercial potential over

fundamental inquiries can skew research agendas, neglecting crucial areas of study without quick financial returns. Reliance on corporate funding introduces risks of conflicts of interest, compromising the integrity and objectivity of academic research.

Additionally, there is the risk of mission drift, where traditional university roles—teaching, research, and community service—are overshadowed by revenue-generating activities. This can undermine the holistic development of students and diminish the broader societal contributions of academic institutions. The short-term financial focus encouraged by market-driven models can compromise the sustainability and quality of academic programs and research initiatives. Culturally, the adoption of market principles within academia can prioritize competition and profitability over collaboration and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, affecting the core values of academic institutions and impacting the morale and motivation of both faculty and students.

### **Contemporary Dynamics of Knowledge Commodification**

In contemporary higher education, the commodification of knowledge manifests through several critical dynamics that reflect broader societal trends and institutional priorities. One notable aspect is the prioritization of STEM fields over the humanities, as evident in funding patterns and resource allocation within universities. Public funding bodies and private corporations are inclined to invest in research with clear economic applications, such as technology development and medical advancements, leading to significant disparities in funding. This inclination often leaves humanities disciplines struggling to secure necessary resources, thereby jeopardizing their programmes and research initiatives (National Science Foundation, 2019).

There is also the commercialization of research which has become a prevalent trend, particularly in fields like biotechnology, engineering, and information technology, where the potential for commercialization is high. Universities increasingly seek to monetize their research outputs through patents, spin-off companies, and industry partnerships. While this can generate revenue and foster innovation, it also shifts the focus of academic research towards projects with immediate market potential, often at the expense of fundamental or theoretical research that lacks direct commercial applications (Etzkowitz, 2003). This trend raises concerns about the long-term implications for the integrity and breadth of academic inquiry. For instance, the pressure to produce commercially viable results might incentivize researchers to prioritize projects that promise quick financial returns over those that contribute to long-term scientific understanding. This can lead to a conflict of interest, where the pursuit of profit may overshadow the commitment to rigorous and unbiased research. Additionally, the reliance on corporate partnerships and funding can introduce external influences that might skew research agendas and outcomes, potentially undermining the objectivity and credibility of academic findings. Also, as universities prioritize projects with immediate market potential, there is a risk that fundamental or theoretical research, which often lacks direct commercial applications, will be undervalued and underfunded. This shift could lead to a reduction in the diversity of research topics explored within academia, limiting advancements in foundational knowledge that could spur future innovations across a wide range of disciplines. The drive for commercialization might therefore stifle scientific curiosity and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, which are core tenets of academic research.

By the same token, the adoption of performance metrics and accountability measures in higher education underscores the commodification of knowledge. Universities are increasingly evaluated

based on quantitative indicators such as graduation rates, employment outcomes, and research income. While these metrics can drive academic behaviours towards achieving measurable outcomes, they often do so at the expense of more qualitative and holistic educational goals. The focus on metrics risks homogenizing academic programmes and narrowing intellectual diversity, ultimately compromising the richness of the educational experience (Ball, 2012). Within this market-oriented framework, the devaluation of humanities scholarship emerges as both a consequence and a symptom of broader trends. Humanities disciplines are often perceived as less economically viable compared to STEM fields. This perception is reflected in funding decisions, institutional priorities, and societal attitudes, leading to significant challenges for humanities scholars. The disparity in funding between humanities and STEM fields is one of the most pronounced issues.

Societal attitudes towards the humanities exacerbate this devaluation. There is a prevailing belief that humanities disciplines do not contribute directly to economic growth and are thus less valuable. This belief is reinforced by media narratives and political rhetoric emphasizing the importance of STEM education and aligning higher education with market demands. Such attitudes discourage students from pursuing humanities degrees and diminish public support for these disciplines, further undermining their role in higher education and society at large (Nussbaum, 2010).

When examined closely, these patterns show a concerning movement in higher education toward a paradigm that puts economic gains ahead of the advancement of knowledge and culture. The fundamental ideas of education as a public good, a place for critical inquiry, and an integrated approach to learning are in danger of being undermined by the commodification of information, which is being pushed by market demands and quantifiable performance indicators. To guarantee that the humanities and the larger

educational landscape can flourish and make a significant contribution to society, addressing these challenges necessitates a reevaluation of financing priorities, institutional support, and social values.

### **Implications for Humanities Scholarship**

The commodification of knowledge has had particularly adverse effects on humanities scholarship. The intrinsic value of the humanities lies in their capacity to foster critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and cultural understanding—qualities that are not easily quantifiable or directly linked to economic outcomes. As a result, humanities disciplines often struggle to justify their relevance within a market-driven academic environment. Given the dynamics of the market, Mark (2011) thinks that many administrators, parents and students tend to now consider the humanities as worth less.

### ***Devaluation of Humanities Scholarship***

One of the consequences of the commodification of knowledge which is global in scale is the devaluation of humanities scholarship within the academia. The humanities have traditionally been seen as vital to the intellectual and cultural fabric of society. The humanities make a substantial contribution to our understanding of human experiences, ideas, and artistic achievements, which in turn develops analytical, critical thinking, and reasoning abilities. They promote the investigation of concepts, moral dilemmas, and the human situation, all of which foster intellectual development. Also, the humanities play a vital role in preserving and interpreting cultural heritage and traditions, fostering an appreciation for the richness and diversity of cultures and histories. They enhance our lives by offering profound insights into art, literature, music, and other forms of cultural expression. For instance, let us consider the philosophical engagement of Afolayan and Falola (2022) with the music of Fela Anikulapo Kuti. The authors situate Fela's music and activism within the historical, cultural and historical contexts of postcolonial Nigeria. They found in Fela's music a

political philosophy – Blackism which was critically engaged. This demonstrates the importance of humanities scholarship in engaging with and critically analysing the ideas that shape cultural and political movements and contexts. In essence, the humanities are seen as fundamental in nurturing a well-rounded, informed, and culturally aware society, facilitating a deeper understanding and appreciation of the complexity and richness of human existence. They foster critical thinking, ethical reasoning, cultural awareness, and a nuanced understanding of human experiences. But in a market-driven learning environment, these subjects are becoming less valued or useful in comparison to STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) sectors, which are closely associated with technological advancement and economic prosperity (Nussbaum, 2010).

One of the most immediate and tangible effects of the devaluation of the humanities is the disparity in funding and resource allocation. Governmental and private funding bodies are more inclined to invest in STEM disciplines due to their perceived direct economic benefits. In the United States, for instance, the National Science Foundation and similar agencies allocate significantly more funding to STEM fields than to the humanities and social sciences (National Science Foundation, 2019). This financial imbalance is also evident in university budgets, where administrative decisions often reflect broader economic priorities, leading to reduced financial support for humanities departments. The implications of this funding disparity are far-reaching. Humanities departments face budget cuts, reduced staffing, and limited resources for research and teaching. These constraints can hinder the ability of humanities scholars to pursue in-depth research, attend conferences, or publish their findings. In extreme cases, entire programmes or departments may be shut down, as universities seek to allocate resources to areas deemed more economically viable. The closure of humanities programmes not only limits educational opportunities for students

but also erodes the intellectual diversity of academic institutions (Klein, 2013).

In the market-driven logic that now dominates higher education, degrees are often evaluated based on their perceived return on investment (ROI), primarily in terms of employability and earning potential. STEM degrees are frequently seen as offering clearer pathways to lucrative careers in growing industries such as technology, healthcare, and engineering. In contrast, humanities degrees are often perceived as offering less direct routes to employment, leading to the misconception that they are less practical or valuable (Bérubé, 2013). This perception influences student choices and enrollment patterns. Many students, facing significant tuition costs and potential student debt, opt for degrees they believe will provide a more secure financial future. Consequently, enrollment in humanities programmes has declined in recent years, further reinforcing the cycle of devaluation. This decline in enrollment not only affects the financial sustainability of humanities departments but also diminishes the diversity of academic inquiry within universities (Donoghue, 2008).

### *Impact on Intellectual Diversity*

The marginalization of the humanities undermines the intellectual diversity that is crucial for a vibrant and comprehensive academic environment. Humanities disciplines offer unique perspectives on human culture, history, and society, fostering critical engagement with contemporary issues such as ethics, identity, and power dynamics. By prioritizing fields with direct economic applications, we risk narrowing the scope of academic inquiry and losing the critical insights that humanities scholarship provides. For example, the study of history offers essential context for understanding current social and political phenomena, while philosophy encourages rigorous ethical reasoning that is crucial for addressing moral dilemmas in various fields. Literature and the arts cultivate empathy and cultural awareness, promoting a more inclusive and tolerant society.

From the point of view of Nussbaum, the devaluation of these disciplines restricts our ability to engage with these important areas of thought, ultimately impoverishing public discourse and societal development.

### ***Educational Mission and Civic Engagement***

The focus on market-driven education also threatens the broader educational mission of universities, which is to cultivate informed, reflective, and engaged citizens. Humanities education plays a critical role in this mission by encouraging students to explore diverse worldviews, question assumptions, and develop a deep appreciation for the complexities of human experience. These skills are not only valuable in their own right but are also essential for active and informed civic engagement. Without robust support for the humanities, the capacity of higher education to fulfil its civic mission is significantly compromised. Graduates may be technically proficient but lack the critical thinking and ethical reasoning skills necessary for responsible citizenship and leadership. This erosion of civic education has broader societal implications, potentially contributing to a less informed and more polarized public (Newfield, 2008).

### **The Need for Revaluation**

Addressing the devaluation of humanities scholarship requires a concerted effort to recognize and articulate the intrinsic and instrumental value of these disciplines. It involves advocating for a more balanced approach to funding and resource allocation, one that appreciates the contributions of the humanities to intellectual diversity, critical thinking, and societal well-being. Moreover, it requires challenging the narrow economic metrics that currently dominate discussions about the value of higher education and promoting a broader understanding of the benefits of a well-rounded education (Bérubé, 2013). By fostering a greater appreciation for the humanities, we can ensure that these disciplines continue to thrive and contribute to the rich tapestry of academic inquiry. This effort

is not only about preserving the past but also about preparing for the future—equipping individuals and societies with the tools they need to navigate an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

Addressing the devaluation of humanities scholarship requires a multifaceted approach that involves advocacy, institutional reform, and broader societal engagement. Several strategies can be employed to counteract this trend and promote the value of the humanities within academia and society. Let us quickly engage with them. Let us begin with advocacy and public engagement. Advocacy efforts aimed at policymakers, university administrators, and the general public are crucial for raising awareness about the importance of humanities scholarship. These efforts can involve public campaigns and outreach events that highlight the contributions of the humanities to culture, democracy, and human flourishing. Engaging with community organizations, cultural institutions, and media outlets can also help broaden public understanding and support for the humanities (Berube, 2013).

Humanities departments can innovate their curricula to better reflect contemporary issues and student interests. This can involve developing interdisciplinary courses that explore pressing social, cultural, and ethical challenges from multiple perspectives. Integrating digital humanities approaches and experiential learning opportunities can also enhance the relevance and appeal of humanities education to students (Burdick et al., 2012). Also, encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration between humanities disciplines and other fields can enhance the visibility and impact of humanities scholarship. Collaborative research projects, joint publications, and interdisciplinary conferences can demonstrate the relevance of humanities perspectives to broader research agendas and societal challenges. These collaborations can also attract funding and support by showcasing the integrative nature of humanities inquiry (Frodeman et al., 2010).



There is no doubting the fact that the devaluation of humanities scholarship within the context of the commodification of knowledge poses significant challenges to higher education and society at large. By marginalizing the humanities, we risk narrowing the scope of academic inquiry, diminishing intellectual diversity, and eroding the critical thinking skills necessary for informed citizenship. However, by advocating for the value of the humanities, diversifying funding sources, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, and engaging with communities, we can work to counteract this trend and ensure that humanities scholarship continues to thrive in the 21st century.

### **The Issues of Intellectual Freedom**

The commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of humanities scholarship pose significant threats to intellectual freedom within academia. Intellectual freedom encompasses the rights of scholars to pursue unfettered inquiry, explore diverse perspectives, and engage in critical dialogue without fear of censorship or reprisal. Intellectual freedom implies that teachers are empowered to become independent thinkers, inventors, researchers, teachers and knowledge creators within the confines of academic practice in the institutions, void of fear of intimidation by the administration or government forces. However, in a market-driven academic environment, these freedoms are increasingly constrained by external pressures and economic incentives.

Corporate influence over university research objectives is one of the main dangers to intellectual freedom. Universities face an increasing risk of corporate sponsors trying to sway research goals and outcomes to suit their interests as they become increasingly dependent on outside funding sources, particularly industrial partnerships (Washburn, 2005). This influence can take many different forms, such as limitations on study subjects, authority over publishing rights, and demands for outcomes that align with business goals. Research agendas influenced by corporations have the

potential to confine the scope of scholarly study by giving priority to issues that are deemed politically or commercially feasible, rather than those that may be more intellectually difficult or socially meaningful. Scholars may feel compelled to self-censor their research or avoid controversial topics to maintain favourable relationships with corporate sponsors, compromising their academic integrity and independence (Giroux, 2014).

Another threat to intellectual freedom stems from the dependence of scholars and institutions on external funding sources, particularly in the context of declining public investment in higher education. With dwindling resources and increasing competition for funding, scholars may feel pressured to tailor their research agendas to align with funding priorities or produce results that are perceived as more marketable (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This pressure can have a chilling effect on academic freedom, as scholars may avoid pursuing research that challenges prevailing paradigms, questions established power structures, or challenges dominant ideologies. The pursuit of tenure, promotion, or research grants may incentivize conformity rather than intellectual risk-taking, leading to a homogenization of academic discourse and a loss of diversity in perspectives (Giroux, 2014).

The fear of economic reprisal or professional repercussions can also lead to self-censorship among scholars, where individuals refrain from expressing controversial opinions or pursuing research that may be perceived as threatening to vested interests. Self-censorship undermines the principle of academic freedom by stifling open inquiry and inhibiting the free exchange of ideas (Washburn, 2005). Moreover, the increasing reliance on adjunct and contingent faculty, who may lack job security and academic freedom protections, further exacerbates the vulnerability of scholars to external pressures. Adjunct faculty members, in particular, may be reluctant to challenge institutional policies or advocate for

controversial positions for fear of losing their precarious employment status.

### **Safeguarding Intellectual Freedom**

To mitigate the threats to intellectual freedom and autonomy posed by the commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of humanities scholarship, several strategies can be employed. One such is ensuring institutional autonomy. Universities must assert their institutional autonomy and resist undue influence from external actors, including corporations and government agencies. This has been a constant struggle in Nigeria. The Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) has been at the centre of this struggle, advocating that Nigerian universities should not be strangled by undue influence from the government. Robust governance structures and academic freedom policies can help protect scholars from external pressures and ensure that research agendas are driven by scholarly merit rather than economic interests (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Another thing we should pay attention to is transparency and accountability. Transparency in research funding and decision-making processes is essential for maintaining academic integrity and public trust. Universities should disclose financial relationships with corporate sponsors and ensure that conflicts of interest are appropriately managed. Additionally, mechanisms for accountability should be in place to address instances of undue influence or ethical breaches (Washburn, 2005).

There is also the need for institutions to actively support scholars engaged in controversial or politically sensitive research, providing them with the resources, protection, and academic freedom necessary to pursue their inquiries. This support can take the form of tenure protections, legal assistance, and institutional advocacy in cases of harassment or censorship (Giroux, 2014). This support is vital in maintaining a robust academic environment where diverse ideas and critical thinking can flourish. When institutions provide

tenure protections, legal assistance, and advocacy in cases of harassment or censorship, they create a safety net that encourages scholars to engage in bold, innovative, and sometimes contentious research without the looming threat of professional or personal repercussions. Such measures demonstrate a commitment to the intrinsic value of academic inquiry and uphold the integrity of the academic institution as a space for free thought and expression. Furthermore, by actively defending scholars' rights to explore and disseminate controversial ideas, institutions help to counteract external pressures and influences that might seek to stifle academic discourse. This not only preserves the autonomy of individual researchers but also strengthens the institution's role as a guardian of academic freedom, ensuring that the pursuit of knowledge remains unimpeded by political or social constraints.

Another point that is germane is the promotion of diversity and inclusion. Embracing diversity in all its forms—disciplinary, ideological, cultural, and demographic—is essential for fostering intellectual freedom and robust scholarly inquiry. Universities should actively promote diversity and inclusion in hiring, promotion, and research funding decisions, ensuring that marginalized voices are heard and valued within the academic community. By incorporating diverse disciplinary perspectives, universities can break down the silos that often hinder interdisciplinary research. This facilitates a more holistic approach to problem-solving and innovation. Ideological diversity, on the other hand, ensures that academic debates are enriched by a plurality of viewpoints, preventing the dominance of any single ideology and promoting a culture of critical thinking and open inquiry. Cultural and demographic diversity further enriches the academic environment by bringing in varied life experiences and worldviews. This is particularly important in a globalized world where understanding and addressing complex issues require insights from multiple cultural perspectives. When marginalized voices are

included and valued, it not only fosters a more equitable academic community but also enhances the richness of scholarly work by incorporating perspectives that might otherwise be overlooked. Universities have a pivotal role in promoting diversity and inclusion through their policies and practices. This includes active efforts in hiring, promotion, and research funding decisions. By prioritizing diversity in these areas, institutions can ensure that a broad spectrum of voices is represented and that systemic biases are addressed. This is crucial for creating an inclusive environment where all members of the academic community feel valued and supported. The work of Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) highlights the importance of these initiatives in promoting a dynamic and inclusive academic environment. Their research suggests that when universities actively promote diversity and inclusion, it leads to a more vibrant intellectual community and better outcomes in terms of scholarly inquiry and innovation.

### **The Role of Humanities in Preserving Intellectual Diversity**

Intellectual diversity in academia refers to the inclusion and representation of a wide range of perspectives, ideologies, and methodologies in scholarly discourse and educational environments. This concept is essential for fostering a robust, dynamic, and comprehensive understanding of complex issues. However, the pursuit and implementation of intellectual diversity in academia face several critical challenges and debates. One significant challenge is the tension between academic freedom and institutional constraints. While universities aim to be bastions of free thought, they often operate within political, social, and economic frameworks that can limit the range of acceptable discourse. For instance, funding sources, donor influences, and political pressures can lead to the marginalization of certain viewpoints, particularly those that challenge prevailing norms or dominant ideologies.

Humanities disciplines play a pivotal role in preserving intellectual diversity within academia and society at large. Through their focus on critical inquiry, cultural analysis, and the exploration of human experience, the humanities offer unique perspectives that enrich our understanding of the world and challenge dominant narratives. However, in the face of increasing pressures to prioritize market-driven outcomes and instrumentalist approaches to education, the importance of the humanities in preserving intellectual diversity cannot be overstated.

One of the primary functions of the humanities is to critically examine and deconstruct dominant narratives that shape our understanding of history, culture, and society. By interrogating power dynamics, challenging received wisdom, and amplifying marginalized voices, humanities scholars provide essential counterpoints to hegemonic discourses (Nussbaum, 2010). For example, in the field of history, scholars explore alternative perspectives on historical events and movements, shedding light on the experiences of marginalized communities and challenging Eurocentric interpretations of the past. Similarly, in literature and cultural studies, scholars analyze representations of race, gender, and sexuality, uncovering the ways in which dominant narratives perpetuate inequalities and exclusionary practices (Foucault, 1972).

The humanities foster critical thinking and analytical skills that are essential for navigating complex issues and engaging with diverse perspectives. Through close reading, textual analysis, and interpretive methods, humanities scholars develop the ability to question assumptions, evaluate evidence, and construct coherent arguments (Nussbaum, 2010). For instance, in philosophy courses, students learn to critically evaluate ethical dilemmas and engage in rigorous moral reasoning. In literature courses, students analyze literary texts from multiple angles, considering historical contexts, authorial intent,

and reader response. These analytical skills enable students to approach complex issues with nuance and sophistication, fostering intellectual flexibility and empathy (Foucault, 1972).

Furthermore, the humanities cultivate empathy and cultural understanding by exposing students to diverse perspectives, experiences, and worldviews. Through the study of literature, art, and philosophy from different cultures and historical periods, students develop the capacity to empathize with others and appreciate the complexities of human existence (Nussbaum, 2010). For example, in courses on world literature, students encounter literary works from a variety of cultural contexts, gaining insights into the lived experiences of people from diverse backgrounds. In art history courses, students explore the visual expressions of different cultures, learning to appreciate the aesthetic, cultural, and historical significance of artistic traditions. These encounters foster a sense of global citizenship and appreciation for the richness and diversity of human culture (Foucault, 1972).

More importantly, the humanities provide a crucial counterbalance to technocratic and utilitarian frameworks that prioritize efficiency, productivity, and quantifiable outcomes. By emphasizing the intrinsic value of humanistic inquiry and the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, humanities scholars challenge the instrumentalist logic that dominates many aspects of contemporary society (Bérubé, 2013). For instance, in debates over education policy, humanities scholars advocate for the inclusion of liberal arts education as a means of fostering well-rounded individuals capable of critical thought and ethical reasoning. In discussions about the role of technology in society, humanities scholars raise questions about the ethical implications of technological advancements and the impact of automation on human labour and culture. By interrogating the underlying assumptions of technocratic discourse, humanities scholars contribute to a more holistic and nuanced

understanding of human flourishing (Foucault, 1972).

It is equally important to note that the humanities provide a forum for exploring ethical and moral dilemmas that lie at the heart of human existence. Through the study of philosophy, literature, and religious texts, scholars grapple with questions of right and wrong, justice and injustice, and the nature of the good life (Foucault, 1972). For instance, in courses on ethics, students engage in debates about moral relativism, utilitarianism, deontology, and other ethical frameworks, considering their implications for personal and societal decision-making. In studies of literature, students confront ethical dilemmas through the experiences of fictional characters, examining how different ethical choices shape narrative outcomes. By wrestling with these ethical complexities, students develop a deeper understanding of the moral dimensions of human behaviour and the ethical responsibilities that accompany citizenship (Nussbaum, 2010).

### **Conclusion**

The commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of humanities scholarship pose significant threats to intellectual freedom and diversity within higher education and society. This multifaceted phenomenon, driven by the ascendancy of neoliberal policies and market-oriented values, has fundamentally reshaped the priorities and practices of academia. The disparity in funding and resource allocation, the prioritization of STEM fields over the humanities, and the commercialization of research and curricula have all contributed to the marginalization of humanities scholarship. This devaluation not only undermines the intrinsic worth of disciplines that foster critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and cultural understanding, but also risks narrowing the scope of intellectual inquiry and eroding the foundations of a well-rounded, engaged citizenry.

The stakes involved in this struggle are high, as the future of higher education and the well-being of our societies hang in the balance. If left unchecked, the commodification of knowledge and the devaluation of the humanities threaten to impoverish our collective intellectual and cultural resources, leaving us ill-equipped to grapple with the pressing challenges of our time. It is, therefore, incumbent upon all stakeholders - scholars, administrators, policymakers, and the broader public - to take decisive action in defence of intellectual freedom and the humanities. This may involve mobilizing grassroots movements, forging cross-disciplinary alliances, and engaging in sustained advocacy to shift the dominant narratives surrounding the value of higher education. Moreover, individual scholars must be empowered and emboldened to pursue intellectually challenging, socially relevant, and potentially controversial lines of inquiry, without fear of reprisal or marginalization. By nurturing a culture of academic courage and ethical integrity, we can ensure that the pursuit of knowledge remains a collective endeavor, driven by curiosity, critical analysis, and a commitment to the betterment of humanity. The preservation of intellectual freedom and the flourishing of the humanities are not merely academic concerns, but essential elements in the struggle to maintain vibrant, democratic societies. As we navigate the complex terrain of the 21st century, the insights, perspectives, and moral fortitude cultivated through the humanities will prove invaluable in guiding us towards a more just, equitable, and sustainable future. The time to act is now before the commodification of knowledge extinguishes the very flame of intellectual inquiry that has illuminated our shared journey as a civilization.

## References

- Afolayan, A., & Falola, T. (2022). *Fela: Life and times of an African musical icon*. Bloomsbury Academic
- Berube, M. (2013). *The Humanities, Higher Education, and Academic Freedom: Three Necessary Arguments*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burdick, A., Drucker, J., Lunenfeld, P., Presner, T., & Schnapp, J. (2012). *Digital Humanities*. MIT Press.
- Donoghue, F. (2008). *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities*. Fordham University Press.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., & Healey, P. (1998). *Capitalizing Knowledge: New Intersections of Industry and Academia*. SUNY Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Frodeman, R., Thompson Klein, J., & Mitcham, C. (2010). *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*. Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Haymarket Books.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Klein, J. T. (2013). *Interdisciplining Digital Humanities: Boundary Work in an Emerging Field*. University of Michigan Press.
- Mark, Henry. (2011). The Future of the Humanities and Liberal Arts in a Global Age. *John Brademas Symposium on the Humanities*,
- Naidoo, R., & Jamieson, I. (2005). Knowledge in the Marketplace: The Global Commodification of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. In J. D. & D. M. (Eds.), *Globalization and Higher Education* (pp. 37-51). Palgrave Macmillan.
- National Science Foundation. (2019). National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. Retrieved from <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf20301/>
- Nenic, Iva. (2009). Commodification of Knowledge Retrieved from [https://www.academia.edu/43219723/COMMODIFICATION\\_OF\\_KNOWLEDGE\\_a\\_short\\_entry\\_](https://www.academia.edu/43219723/COMMODIFICATION_OF_KNOWLEDGE_a_short_entry_)
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class*. Harvard University Press
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Washburn, J. (2005). *University Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education*. Basic Books.
- Wilkinson, L. C., & Wilkinson, M. D. (2020). Value for money and the commodification of higher education: front-line narratives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(2), 406–422.