CSHE | Center for Studies in Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
http://cshe.berkeley.edu/

DYNAMICS OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES[*]

February 2012

Neil J. Smelser
UC Berkeley

ABSTRACT
The history of higher education has revealed all the forms of structural change associated with growth. The following focuses on a special form that involves growth, specialization, and proliferation, and applies mainly but not exclusively to universities. In search for a descriptive term, I have settled on the concept of "structural accretion," a composite form of growth. Its simple definition is incorporation of new functions over time without, however, shedding existing ones or splitting into separate organizations. It is a complex process reflecting, in the main, the following driving forces: expanding as a result of new opportunities for activities, usually but not always relevant to the main missions of the university: the fact that most growth has been a matter of mutual opportunism; and the power of academic competition and emulation in a highly stratified prestige hierarchy of institutions. This paper reflects the first of three Clark Kerr Lectures on the Role of Higher Education in Society given on January 24, 2012 by Neil J. Smelser on the Berkeley campus and on the subject of "Higher Education: The Play of Continuity and Crisis."

It is a custom on this occasion to honor the figure for whom these lectures are named and to acknowledge how deeply honored I am to have been chosen to deliver them. I do both these things, not out of the pressure of ceremony, but from the heart. Clark Kerr was (and is) such an important part of my own career that I must add a personal note.

I met Clark Kerr in 1958, about two weeks after I arrived on the Berkeley campus as a new assistant professor. He, as new President, and Glenn Seaborg, as new Chancellor, had invited faculty appointees to a welcoming social occasion. We merely shook hands at the time, and to him I was a face in the crowd, but I did know of his heroics in the loyalty-oath crisis years earlier. I could not have known that in the coming decade he would lead California into its magnificent Master Plan, enunciate his historic conception of the multiversity, ride herd over multiple crises in the 1960s, establish his presidency as a legendary one, and become the century's leading spokesman for higher education.

In the following decade I myself was drawn into campus affairs in such a way that Clark Kerr came to notice me, and he invited me to join the Technical Advisory Committee of his Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. There I, along with Martin Trow, Sheldon Rothblatt, Bud Cheit, and Fred Balderston, came to constitute a group that I called "Clark's boys." My relationship with Clark was cemented in those years, and he sought my advice on diverse matters and ultimately my help with his memoirs. Clark Kerr and I would meet in the Clark Kerr Room of the Men's Faculty Club, and I would always order the Clark Kerr Special from the menu, even when I didn't like the plate. It was a humbling honor when Clark invited me to write the Forward to *The Gold and the Blue* (Kerr, 2001; Kerr, 2003) from a crowd of much more visible and notable candidates. I apologize for this too-personal introduction, but I felt it important to reveal the depth of memories and feelings I have on this occasion.

Apologia

I now offer an apology for how I am going to proceed. As I have been covering the recent literature on higher education, reading the press, and conversing with colleagues and friends, I get a picture of urgency and crisis. We are being starved by the public and the politicians; tenure is disappearing with the proletarianization of the academic labor force; the idea of the university is being eroded by the forces of the market and corporatization; and we are being threatened by the spectacular growth of on-line, for-profit organizations of questionable quality.

I know these questions are on your minds as well, and I feel the pressure to put my two cents' worth on these overwhelming issues right away. In the context of such urgency, it is almost a matter for personal guilt if I don't. I can assure you that I will comment, but not right away, not from the hip, and not in the language of the day. If I did so, I am confident I would add nothing to the babble of voices. As an alternative, I am going to try to elucidate a few first principles about the nature of higher education (especially the university), particularly about its change and stability. So, in the first lecture I will develop a little theory of change in higher education, using historical and contemporary examples; in the second I will trace some of the endless ramifications of these principles; and in the third—using the foregoing analyses—I will develop assessments and conditional predictions about higher education's major contemporary problems as they are superimposed on its structural history.

One final apology: my academic career has been that of a social scientist, or more precisely a sociologist afflicted with an incurable interdisciplinary impulse. I have also had a lifetime of immersion in my university's departmental, administrative, and academic senate affairs. Such diversity of experience often produces eclectic, contingent outlooks. But in these lectures, my approach will be primarily that of a sociologist. In particular I will be guided by the idea of a *social system*. This stress has weakened in the social sciences in the past several decades, along with the atrophy of interest in social theory in general, but it is clearly relevant to the study of higher education. Elsewhere I have argued (Smelser, 2001, pp. xvii-xix) that some of Clark Kerr's extraordinary success as Chancellor and President could be assigned to his understanding of the "systemness" of his university—the intricate relations among its many parts and its relations to its environments.

By "system" I mean an entity with identifiable but interrelated parts, such that changes in one part influence the other parts and the entity as a whole. The campus-based college or university with its departments, schools, layers of administration, and support systems—to say nothing of its array of internal constituencies—is surely a system. So is a multi-campus system, though perhaps in a looser sense. And so is higher education as a whole with its differentiated segments and types of institutions. The notion of *open system* gives importance to forces external to it. The idea of system also equips one with tools to analyze the ramifications of discrete changes and their consequences. Finally, a system perspective permits us to generate new insights about many murkier, evasive aspects of our history and our contemporary situation. In addition to this stress, I will make extensive use of the concepts of culture (including subculture), social structure, and groups and group conflict, all standard items in the sociological repertoire. Finally, however, to understand higher education and its dynamics, one must—and I will—bring in selectively tools and insights from economics, history, political science, anthropology, and psychology.

I might cite a final advantage of thinking systemically about higher education. We know so much and we say so much about the characteristics, the history, the nature, and the problems higher education, that our minds are in danger of being overloaded. We academics are great observers, talkers, writers, and worriers; our stock-in-trade is words and insights. This brings to mind the anecdote about a committee meeting at which the chair confidently says he thinks the group has come to closure on an issue, but one committee member objects and says, "but we haven't said everything that's ever been said on the subject." I do not threaten to do that, but by appealing to the idea of system I hope modestly to make a few new *connections* between known or asserted things. Why, for example, is it that higher education is simultaneously known to be an institution with a history of spectacular growth and solid institutionalization *and* simultaneously proclaimed to be in crisis or doomed (Birnbuam and Shushok, 2001)? Why are our universities so admired and emulated abroad and so bashed within our boundaries? Why are universities and kindred institutions, so splendid and serene in hope and theory, also fraught with internal ambivalence and group conflict? In these lectures I hope to make some sense of these and other questions.

What Kind of Creature is Higher Education?

I begin not with a formal definition of higher education but a listing of its most salient characteristics as a social institution—characteristics essential for the analysis presented in these lectures.

Functions. Describers, apologists, advocates, commentators, and historians of higher education often list a number of its functions, almost all positive. There is variation but some consensus on the following in the literature:

- To preserve, create, advance and transmit knowledge to the young, who will be future professional, political, and business leaders of society.

- To impart ranges of expertise to those who will be leaders.

- To serve society more directly by providing useful knowledge for economic growth and prosperity, and community development (Trani and Holsworth 2010).

- To foster individual achievement, social mobility, equality of opportunity, and social justice.

- To serve democracy further by improving the literacy, knowledge, rationality, tolerance and fair-mindedness, and responsible participation on the part of citizens. This has served as a main buttressing argument for liberal and general education.

- To preserve, develop, and augment the general cultural values of our civilization, both by cultivating those values among the young and honing of them through constant and responsible criticism.

- At a different level, to come to the assistance of the nation in its vital struggles—for example, wars, international political competition, and heightened economic competition associated with globalization (Duderstadt, 2000).

The Problematic Status of "Functions"

This list is fair enough. However, I have come to regard this kind of presentation as problematical in some respects. I list my reservations:

- The exact conceptual status of these activities as "functions" is unclear. They may be regarded as descriptions of what institutions *accomplish*; they may be regarded as ideals or goals for which they *strive* bur attain only partially; they may be regarded as a source of cultural *legitimacy* for institutions of higher education, which, like all institutions, require such legitimacy to secure their place, their support, and their continuity in society; or finally and more cynically, they may be regarded as a form of *advocacy*, namely as claims to prestige and status, ploys in seeking support, or intellectualized defenses by spokesman in institutions under attack. They are all these things, of course, but the multiple connotations make for ambiguity and perhaps conflict with respect to the status and meaning of the claimed functions.

- Insofar as they are claimed to describe what educational institutions do, they involve *causal claims*—that is to say, usually implicit assertions that certain lines of activity (teaching, conducting research, advising governments) actually have the intended, usually positive effects. These claims are difficult if not impossible to establish definitively or scientifically. All that we know from evaluation research on "results of schooling," "educational impact," and the general relations between knowledge and policy demonstrates that multiple variables are at work and that it is extremely difficult to establish reliable relationships between intervention and outcome, even though elaborate quasi-experimental efforts to control the effects of contaminating variables are made (Rossi and Freeman, 1992).

- It follows that there is inevitably a residue of generalized *faith* that the activities of institutions of higher education are fulfilling their functions adequately or fully. Moreover, this faith usually is not automatically granted and therefore rests on shakier grounds than in other areas (health, protecting the nation, and sufficiency in agriculture) in which the goals are matters of vital importance and high consensus.

As a result of these difficulties in describing abstract functions, I am going to view the "functions" of higher education more concretely and historically—namely as sequence of "compacts" between agencies *outside* those institutions (states, the federal government, philanthropists and donors, interested commercial and industrial parties, and a real and imagined "public"). For example, Thelin concludes that "federal government support for higher education displays a distinctive characteristic: it often is a convenient means for the U.S. government to attain larger national goals" (2004b, p. 37). States are interested in the correlations between the proportion of their students enrolled in higher education and their rate of economic growth (Zumeta, 2004) (even though the direction of causality may be questionable). Actually, the relationship is more complex; it is one of mutual opportunism: external persons or agencies perceive an opportunity, a belief that higher education is a valuable asset in pursuing one or more of their purposes, and educational institutions accept these offers opportunistically; or, if they are more proactive, those institutions invent and seek out new functions as a way of enhancing their competitive position and survival.

The "compacts" emerging from these relationships are typically not strict contracts in the legal sense of goods or services being delivered for specific consideration. State governments expect that state colleges and universities will serve mainly the citizens of

the state, and those institutions generally comply. Colleges and universities use philanthropic donations for designated purposes, but resist conditions of regulation by donors, delivery of specific services, and guarantee of specific "outcomes." Academic freedom is granted with implicit expectations that academics will not exploit the privilege or behave in uncivil ways. Correspondingly these compacts have had mainly *generalized* expectations, unspoken assumptions, and trust.

 We may say at this early moment, then, that even at the most fundamental level institutions of higher education, both in their functions and in their relations with external agencies exhibit notable levels of ambiguity, non-specificity, and taken-for-grantedness. In my estimation these have been great institutional advantages for colleges and universities, essential for their freedom, autonomy, and adaptability. Yet those very qualities of vagueness increase the probabilities of misunderstandings, disappointments, conflicts, ex-post-facto accusations of promises made but not kept, as well as recriminations and defenses against those recriminations. The functions I have identified—what society has asked of higher education—do not guarantee such outcomes, but they tilt the system in the direction of producing them.

Moral Embeddedness.

Cutting across these functional linkages between higher education and society is one final fundamental characteristic. Education in general and higher education in particular are inevitably matters of *moral* concern. This is grounded in two circumstances. First, all education is directly involved in the institutionalization, reproduction, and transmission of the fundamental values of society to succeeding generations—always a moral matter. Second, the historical heritage of higher education is profoundly moral. From their medieval beginnings, its activities were indistinguishable from religious morality. This translated itself to the view of the university as a *sacred* entity, and, for its members, the idea that involvement in the university represented a higher religious *calling*. Even though most universities have been "de-churched" (Tuchman, 2009) and are by now fully secular institutions, versions of the sacred, ecclesiastical hierarchy, and the calling exist in recognizable form (see Brubacher, 1978). Brint recently observed that "[e]ducation is as close to a secular religion as we have in the United States" (2011, p. 2).

In modern garb this includes the ideas that education's work is of the highest value (example: "The university preserves and interprets the best of what human intelligence has created and written"—Hearn, 2006, p. 160); that that work demands love; and that educators should manifest a certain ascetic, anti-materialistic attitude (which conveys further that one should not want and/or become too involved in worldly rewards). These ideals are held, in variable form and strength, by those *in* the academy and as expectations for the academy on the part of those *outside* it. The three basic historical roles of higher education—teaching, search for knowledge, and service to society—are each endowed with the connotation that they are publicly valued missions. Part—but only part—of the claims of higher education to status, public support, and legitimacy is a matter of representing itself, and being regarded by outsiders as a *higher* activity, no longer fully priestly but having some of those qualities and roles.

Three corollaries follow from the postulate that institutions of higher education are seats of claims to and recognition of high moral purpose:

> First, claims to a morality (and special expertise) generate special and high *expectations*, both within the academy and in the larger public. If a class of activities is designated as special and superior, those practitioners of them are expected to live up to those standards. This has been a constant characteristic of priestly and quasi-priestly classes—the pressure to live up to their billing.

> Second, on the basis of such claims, academic classes are typically granted *high status* and do not hesitate to accept and claim that status. Nor do they hesitate to grant others less status. Balderston (1974) argued that "administrative staff members, including those at professional and senior levels, cannot share directly in this [academic] status system and are, worse yet, sometimes the victims of academic snobbery and contempt for bureaucracy" (p. 80). Duderstadt, himself a long-serving president in a leading university, commented simply that "[academic] arrogance knows no bounds" (2000, p. 123).

> Third, an inevitable ingredient that accompanies claims to moral commitment is that high expectations and high status is that *deviation* from its standards is more than simple straying. It is tinged with the corruption of the sacred, and thus justifies strong moral reactions.   Consistently, the preferred mode of reflecting and writing on colleges and universities has been one of morality and moral passion. Colleges and universities embody the highest of hopes and the greatest of despair, blame, and moral loss when these hopes seem to be compromised. That language is infused with the positive affects of love, admiration and rhapsody and the negative affects of disappointment, betrayal, and outrage. With all this the stage is set for recurrent episodes of scapegoating.

I hope that these general reflections will prove useful in enlightening the endemic conflicts that swirl around processes of change in academia (below, pp. 00-00). But I do not wish to press these observations too far and claim that the moral dimension is the

sole or strongest ingredient of higher education; secular elements abound in academic culture. But it cannot be ignored as a heritage and a reality, and if we do not keep it in mind we cannot understand what has transpired and is transpiring.

The peculiarities I have identified—functions, relations with society, and moral embeddedness—supply the context for the topics to which I now turn: growth and change in American higher education. In fact, that process of growth itself is a distinctive feature of higher education. But that growth, to be understood, has to be regarded in relation the heritage of societal involvement and moral embeddedness.

Structural Changes Accompanying Growth

Growth has been the hallmark of American higher education in the past one and one-half centuries. This has been pulsating, to be sure, with periods of extremely rapid increase in, for example, the late nineteenth century and the two decades following World War II, as well as periods of stagnation such as Great Depression and the 1970s and l980s. We will examine the causes and consequences of such irregularities as we go along, but initially we must clear some theoretical ground.

One way of tracking growth is by different quantitative indices—expenditures, numbers of students, faculty, graduates, and institutions. These reveal its magnitude. However, social scientists know that neither rapid nor long-term growth typically occurs without some qualitative changes in the *social structures* involved in that growth. The following are some typical structural processes:

Increasing the Size of Units

Much population growth—that associated with increases in fertility—occurs through the increasing size of families, among other changes. While this may entail changes in intra-family dynamics it does not directly produce structures *other* than the family. In higher education we observe the same principle, for example, in campus policies of expanding enrollment of students and size of faculty in the face of increasing demand. Increases in size typically create some economies of scale but sooner or later reach a limit and generate pressures for other kinds of structural change.

Segmentation of Units

This form of change is also relatively simple in that it involves the simple increase of identical or similar units. It is another structural concomitant of population change, namely the multiplication of family units without significant structural changes in family structure. Another example is an automobile manufacturer's decision to increase the number of retail outlets in response to augmented demand. The rapid increase in numbers of four-year and community colleges between 1950 and 1970 is an example from higher education, as is the increase in numbers of for-profit distance-learning institutions in recent decades.

Differentiation

This is one of the most widespread structural concomitants of growth and efficiency. It is the principle in Adam Smith's formula of the division of labor (specialization) leading to greater productivity and wealth—a formula he associated explicitly with growth. Whole institutions can also become more specialized as well. Much of the story of the Western family during the history of industrialization, for example, was its <u>loss</u> of functions as a productive economic unit (wage labor outside the family accomplished that); as a welfare system (the growth of public welfare accomplished that); as an instrumental training ground (mass primary and secondary education accomplished that); and as a principal agency for sustaining the aged (social-security systems accomplished that) (Ogburn and Nimkoff, 1955). In the process the family become more specialized, responsible mainly for regulating intimacy and caring for and socializing young children. Specialization has also been the name of the game in education as well, resulting not only in the differentiation of primary, secondary, and tertiary forms, but also in the proliferation of different types of different-purpose institutions, such as community colleges, vocational schools, four-year colleges vocational schools, and research universities. Some European and other systems have separated higher learning into universities and research academies.

Proliferation, or adding new functions to existing structures

Expanding business firms add new departments or divisions to handle new functions (sales divisions for new regional markets, human relations departments, research-and-development divisions) as their operations expand. So do government bureaucracies. In higher education, an example is the creation of multiple curricula in community colleges to accommodate academic programs necessary for transfer to four-year institutions, terminal vocational degrees and "preparation for life" courses (Brint and Karabel, 1989). We will also discover that proliferation has been a favored strategy for universities as well, adding one function after another, with a peculiar twist. The obverse of proliferation is the shedding of functions, either outright or through downsizing or outsourcing.

Coordination, or the development of activities and structures to deal with the consequences of increased scale and structural change
The impact of all the above structural processes, considered together, is to produce not only larger but also more complex structures with many more moving parts. We owe it to Durkheim (1997 [1893] who insisted that increases in social complexity (division of labor) inevitably occasion the need for new kinds of integration in society. That principle has been discovered and re-discovered in organizational studies, politics and administration, and in studies of whole societies (see Simon, 2001), to say nothing of the administration of campuses and the coordination of multi-campus systems. Coordination encompasses new demands for routine management, for assuring that the many hands of complex organizations know what the others are doing, and for anticipating, containing, and handling conflicts among differentiated units and groups. This final principle constitutes an important modification of any simple theory of economies of scale, because increases in scale of all types demand new structures, mechanisms, knowledge, and accompanying financial resources to deal with size and complexity.

I submit this classification of structural changes—increase in unit size, segmentation, differentiation, proliferation, and coordination—*both* as a set of tools for analyzing the kinds of changes experienced by higher education *and* as a key to understanding phenomena in those institutions that may be otherwise baffling. Two points will emerge: (a) the "choice" of directions of structural change is constrained by external restrictions and opportunities; and (b) the different kinds of social change ramify in different directions, and express themselves in distinctive anomalies and contradictions, status hierarchies, strategic adaptations, and patterns of competition and conflict. We simply cannot unravel these ramifications without understanding institutions' structural situations.

A Peculiar Case in Higher Education: Structural Accretion
As the illustrations in the last section reveal, the history of higher education has revealed all the forms of structural change associated with growth. I would like to spend some time on a special form that involves growth, specialization, and proliferation, and applies mainly but not exclusively to universities. In search for a descriptive term, I have settled on the concept of "structural accretion," a composite form of growth.[*] Its simple definition is incorporation of new functions over time without, however, shedding existing ones or splitting into separate organizations. It is a complex process reflecting, in the main, the following driving forces:

- Expanding as a result of new opportunities for activities, usually but not always relevant to the main missions of the university. Rosenzweig put the culture of growth simply: "The institutional impulse is not to restrain growth but to support it . . . Standing still . . . is contrary to the nature of the beast, and contraction is simply an abomination" (1998, p. 156).

- The fact that most growth has been a matter of mutual opportunism—the belief on the part of external agencies that universities are an appropriate or effective place to invest resources in line with their own interests and purposes, and the dependence of universities mainly on external subsidization.

- The power of academic competition and emulation in a highly stratified prestige hierarchy of institutions. Stadtman enunciated this as a principle: "the tendency for institutions to emulate the most prestigious, largest, and most secure colleges and universities" (1980, p. 95).

- Institutional inertia, university politics, and the shortage of mechanisms to insure the shedding of adopted activities.

The ingredients of accretion have been noted by observers of higher education. The accumulation of functions was captured fifty years ago by Clark Kerr's (1963) invention of the term "multiversity," connoting that accumulation. He also identified the inertial side by noting cryptically that "[c]hange comes through spawning the new than reforming the old" (*ibid*., p. 102). More recently

---

[*] The exact naming of this type of change itself has had a little history. In thinking about the phenomenon over the years, I had settled on the term, "blistering," as connoting a growth on the side of an organism without disturbing its fundamental organic unity. (I had also conceived the idea of an "onion" principle, but my colleague, Mac Laetsch, a botanist at the University of California, Berkeley, corrected this analogy and saved me embarrassment by reminding me that onions do not layer on the outside but grow by adding at the center). A few months ago, at a meeting of a small administrator-faculty group on the Berkeley campus—called the Wellman group—several of my colleagues objected to "blistering" because of its negative connotations: blisters are painful and caused by irritation. Also, blisters go away on their own, unlike academic additions. I agreed that I did not want those connotations. My colleagues suggested "grafting" (which does not really seem to connote structural change); "bureaucratic creep" (also negative in its connotations and does not include all the kinds of changes I had in mind); even "adventitious budding," an analogy from plant life (but difficult to explain). Karl Pister, a member of the group, suggested simply "accretion," which is a neutral word and does not carry the unwanted connotations. I accepted that term and am grateful to Karl; I added "structural" to give it more specific reference to the kinds of organizational change I have in mind.

Altbach observed that "[w]hen faced with new situations, the traditional institutions either adjust by adding functions without changing their basic character or create new divisions or institutes" (2001, p. 30). Diffusion through competitive copycatting has also been noted as a principle; "[institutions] build prestige by mimicking institutions that already have prestige" (Brewer, et al., 2002, p. 66). And faculty conservatism has been frequently identified as one of the most powerful forces in the academy (also Kerr, 1963); one critic speaks of "four hundred years of resistance to change in modes of instruction" (Marcus, 2011, p. 41). Antagonism to change is a perhaps the most well-worn theme in academic humor. [Riddle: "What is more difficult to change than the course of history? Answer: "A history course" (Smith, 2010, p. 322). Riddle: "How many Oxford dons does it take to change a light bulb?" Answer: "Change?"]. Over the years, moreover, faculties appear to have cultivated the art of resistance commensurate with their levels of intelligence and ingenuity. After a long season of entrepreneurial efforts of running his proposal to establish the Said Business School through faculty committees at Oxford, John Kay concluded that the committee system had elevated the avoidance of decision-making into a high art form. He identified "eight oars of indecision": deferral, referral, procedural objection, "the wider picture," evasion, ambiguity, precedent, and denial (Kay, 2000). Perhaps he could have discovered even more than eight had he not been constrained by the metaphor of the rowing shell.

Despite these observations, I know of no general statement that integrates all these ingredients, much less traces out the ramifications of the process into almost every aspect of university life. I undertake both those tasks in these lectures.

A Historical Sketch of the Process
Here is a very brief, idealized history of the cumulative accretion in universities:

- In the colonial period and through the early nineteenth century institutions taught and trained elite classes through the baccalaureate degree or its equivalents.

- Dramatized by Yale's introduction of the Ph.D. in 1860, universities consolidated post-graduate training during the last half of the nineteenth century, without, however, surrendering undergraduate studies.

- Also in the same period, professional schools of law and medicine were introduced as adjuncts to universities (Kimball, 2009), and the list of professions served increased over time to include the long list with which we are now familiar. With respect to schools of education, universities came to supplement the work of the normal schools and teachers' colleges. This contrasted with the continued vitality of professional apprenticeship systems *outside* the universities in many other countries. Addition of professional education, however, did not result in the desertion of existing activities. They added to them and extended and intensified the "service to society and community" functions.

- Concomitant with the growth of post-graduate education, universities aggressively introduced and gave high priority and prestige to Humboldt's visions of research, and created the academic department as the long-standing organizational venue for its execution. Over time the number of departments has increased (e.g., the addition of the social sciences in the very late nineteenth century, and the addition of computer studies and communication studies in recent decades). So fundamental were these additions that by 1905 Abraham Flexner could declare that " . . . the university has sacrificed the college at the altar of research" (quoted in Scarlett, 2004, p. 39).

  More was to come. The philanthropic efforts of foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, as well as the federal government in the Vanever Bush and post-sputnik eras expanded scientific research in universities to unprecedented heights. This spilled over in lesser degree to the social sciences and more negligibly into the humanities. As structural manifestations of expansion we find campuses honeycombed with centers and institutes—called organized research units—that are often interdisciplinary and structurally separated from academic departments. Reflecting the increased role of government, many institutions of higher education developed "government relations" offices to keep contact and lobby with relevant agencies (McMillen, 2010). Yet we also kept and expanded undergraduate, graduate, and professional education.

- The most recent phase (over the past 30 years) has seen the growth of sponsored and collaborative research with business organizations, sponsored research, collaborative research, and spin-off enterprises with faculty leadership. This also fits the pattern of accretion, and later we will treat the topic more fully, along with other "invasions" of commercial forces into campuses.

- Over time colleges and universities have expanded into international education, beginning with standard "junior year abroad" programs but recently becoming more diversified and extended into post-graduate and research activities—all part of the rapid globalization of higher education.

- As adjuncts to the standard baccalaureate programs colleges and universities extended into the areas of correspondence courses, summer schools, workshops, etc., to serve regular students who wanted to accelerate their progress or repeat flunked courses, professionals to improve their certification, and more mature students generally. Most colleges and universities tried to make these programs self-financing; they were also an important wedge for the practice of hiring temporary and part-time faculty.

- The most recent line of accretion in this family (along with the differentiation of private teaching institutions separate from the residentially-based institution) is "distance learning," a huge and ill-understood series of changes, which Gregorian recently identified as the most important trend in higher education (2004). We only note this in the context of "accretion" at the moment, and consider it separately later.

- From time to time universities have embedded more traditional "intimate" collegiate programs into their larger, department-dominated programs of "majors." I have in mind the Monteith College at the University of Michigan, and the Tussman and Muscatine experiments on the Berkeley campus in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as many less conspicuous interdisciplinary programs. Historically, these enterprises have proved to be vulnerable, largely because, unlike departments and other units, they are typically financed on a year-by-year basis and subject to discontinuation, and they rely on faculty who make requests for reduction of departmental teaching commitments in order to participate—requests that are not welcomed by department chairs.

- Over time colleges and universities added public entertainment (mainly in the form of intercollegiate athletic contests) and cultural enlightenment (museums, public lectures, dramatic and musical performances). Intercollegiate athletics is regarded by many as a cancer rather than an accretion, out of control because of pressures from alumni, media, and public love of competitive sports (below, pp. 00-00). With these also came intramural athletics and departments and programs of physical education, which, while often drawing faculty ridicule for having no place in academic institutions, persisted and grew all the same. These ancillary activities were also added to the institutions' other ongoing activities.

- Universities added academic presses as an avenue both for faculty publication of scholarly research (increasingly salient for tenure-track faculty members requiring evidence of such research as the most important ingredient for their professional advancement) and as a further instrument for cultural enlightenment of the public.

- Offices for Institutional research have become common installations, providing the databases and analyses for the multiplicity of functions and complexity of decision-making in complex organizations (Swing, 2009).

- Typically universities and some colleges fashion accretions that are designed to facilitate creating, consolidating, or producing *other* accretions. I have in mind fund-raising and development offices, campaign committees, alumni-relations offices, sponsored research offices, and technology-transfer offices. I could only experience a sense of irony when I came across a number of "advisory points" in a fund-raising handbook for presidents: appoint an extraordinary vice president for development with "an impressive office near yours" and membership on your top advisory council. Appoint a fund-raising consultant. Also, start a personal fund-raising library, conduct a feasibility study, and develop a case statement. Finally, "approve a budgetary allocation that is more than you are initially inclined to grant" [!] (Fisher, 1989, p. 16).

- Social movements and other public pressures have added irregularly to the accretion process. The most notable examples are the spread of academic programs and departments of women's studies, ethnic studies, and gay and lesbian studies in the wake of external and internal pressures associated with corresponding social movements. Also opposed by some faculty as not having a proper academic basis, these have become standard features on many university and college campuses. Combined internal and external forces have most recently produced a growth of programs and departments in environmental studies.

- Among the great paradoxes of administrative accretion is that all kinds of fortunes—both good and bad—provide motives for increasing it. In good times the motives seem self-evident. They call for increases in administrative staffs for newly-forming research institutes; augmentation of counseling; financial aid and other student services; establishing and expanding sponsored research offices to capitalize on expanding opportunities; and beefing up development and fund-raising staffs to exploit expanding opportunities. Bad times would seem to call for shrinkage of administration, but it does not shrink. In the "new depression" of the 1970s and 1980s (Cheit, 1971) that involved shrinking enrollments and shrinking sources of support, the rate of growth of administrative personnel between the decade from

1975 and 1985 was 60%, while the growth of faculty was only 6% (Zemsky, *et al.*, 2005). Why should a period of relative poverty call for such expansion? The main causes are increased pressures to gain a competitive edge in seeking students, securing financial aid, private gifts, and state support—all diminishing but, *as a result*, calling for greater investment in staff simultaneously to squeeze out what can be squeezed under the circumstances. Administering organizational cuts also calls for staff time in determining what these might be and how to deal with resistances to them. As a result of this paradox, there seems to be no time in the history of colleges and universities that does not call for some kinds of new administrative staff, whether to maximize gains or minimize losses.

Such are the major lines of structural accretions that have in the long run created the multiversity, or the distinctive American "bundle" referred to by Parsons (1973). The process has been realized mainly in the universities, largely because they are less constrained by law and tradition from expanding, and because external sponsoring agencies choose universities on account of their relatively unconstrained ability to take on new activities and because they are, by knowledge and reputation, "the best." Donors, foundations, governments, and businesses prefer to choose "the best" to maximize the success of their own funding.

The accretion principle has also affected other segments of higher education, though less so than the universities, and by mechanisms, as follows:

State colleges, many of them having evolved from teachers' colleges, have had a long history of competition and emulation of the state's universities. This has taken the form of changing their names to "state universities," striving for equity in teaching loads, salaries and sabbatical relief, building research into their programs, and adding advanced degree programs (though most are excluded legally from offering the doctorate and some professional degrees). Many of these efforts involve adding programs and units and thus constitute accretions. Status striving is the main engine: universities compete with one another for external sources as a means of expanding their activities, programs, and standing; state universities compete with universities to approach status-equality. The long-standing striving of the polytechnics to gain parity with the universities in the United Kingdom is a conspicuous example from abroad.

Accretion in the community colleges is still another variant. As mainly public institutions they have traditionally been restricted to two-year degree programs (and prohibited from offering others), though some have succeeded in converting to four-year colleges, and many states now permit granting of baccalaureate degrees by community colleges—an accretion. Research at the community college level has been minimal. The main form of accretion has been curricular: continuing to offer preparatory liberal-arts transfer programs, but expanding their curricula—typically in response to market opportunities and demands and the political influence of localities exercised directly and through governing boards—to offer more specialized vocational courses (Griffith and Connor, 1994). The expansion of "preparation for life" courses without abandoning the other lines of instruction is a further example. Within each of three general categories, programs and units are added as demands or opportunities arise.

In addition to proliferation within organizations, the failure to abandon what has been added in the past is an essential ingredient of accretion. This is not a feature unique to educational institutions—organizational inertia is real and alive everywhere—but it is extreme in educational institutions, and it is important to understand why. I offer of the following considerations:

- There exists no ready mechanism for "going out of business" in the academy, as is possible through the mechanism of failure in commercial markets. Public institutions traditionally have been recipients of annually appropriated block grants from state governments as their main financial support, with varying degrees of control over specific programs or units within them. State governments are reluctant to let the institutions they have formed go out of business; it is difficult to imagine any one of the 50 states of the union deciding to junk one of "their" institutions—much less, the flagship university of the state—rational though that may be on administrative or economic grounds. Legislatures meddle in the administration of their institutions, but are reluctant to kill them. Private institutions are governed more autonomously, though governing boards have also been reluctant to shut them down unless extreme economic conditions make it absolutely necessary.

- We must also point to the institution of academic tenure. Insofar as an academic unit involves tenured faculty as members, this constitutes a barrier to elimination. Tenure as an institution refers primarily to academic freedom, though over time it has accumulated the element of permanent job security. It is, in principle, legal and acceptable to terminate tenured faculty when units are eliminated (below, pp. 00-00). This occurs, but with great reluctance on the part of administrators, who either avoid the possibility or find places for tenured faculty in other units. The consequence is that "[tenure] inhibits managerial flexibility in moving faculty and changing academic institutions" (Rhoades, 1998, p. 84). We will return to other aspects of academic tenure later.

- A third reason arises from a set of social-science axioms that apply especially to academic institutions. The logic is as follows: if you take on a new *function*, you must add new a new *structure* to perform it (an organized research unit, an administrative division, a special office); if you create a structure and you also create a *group* of people to staff it; if you create a *group*, you also create a new *constituency*, one which, typically, includes as one its primary interests its own survival and enhancement. By this logic the process of proliferation of functions also generates internal political constituencies. These press their interests through strategies of argument, influence, and stonewalling, mainly in budget-preparing and budget-renewing seasons. It is a final part of this axiomatic system that administrators, for reasons of political survival, tend not to go in for outright killing of units, but to shave around the edges. In hard times you stop cutting the grass, but you don't cut the faculty. Summarizing the patterns of cuts in the 1980s and 1990s, with many periods of budgetary adversity, Altbach cites the reluctance to alter drastically programs or priorities but instead, support staff were eliminated and maintenance was deferred. A hiring freeze was put into place, salaries were frozen, and part-time teachers replaced full-time faculty. Libraries were unable to buy books, and journal collections were cut. Yet only a handful of colleges or universities violated the tenure of senior faculty. Departments were seldom eliminated, even where enrollments were low. Administrators tried to "protect the faculty," even at the expense of rational planning or institutional development. A few of the weakest private colleges merged or closed. Virtually no public institutions were closed, even where campus closures or mergers would have been in the best interests of the statewide system (2001, p. 34).

As an external advisor to Yale social sciences in the 1990s, I witnessed Yale's effort to eliminate, selectively, several "problematic" academic departments evolve first into a significant faculty revolt and then to the disappearance, through resignation, of three top administrators instead of the removal of several academic departments (for a brief account, see Rosenzweig, 1998). On the other hand, recent history records some successful efforts to eliminate degree programs and departments, engineered with great dexterity (e.g., Kirwan, 2006).

In the literature on higher education we do come across some talk of "unbundling," but most suggestions deal with outsourcing or privatization of activities without perceived direct educational functions: campus food services, bookstores, operation of student, health services, security services, and plant and utility infrastructures (Langenberg, 1999). Duderstadt (2000) also mentions admissions, counseling, and certification as possibilities for unbundling. There is discussion and some activity in outsourcing subjects like introductory language instruction to community colleges and elsewhere—subjects already "outsourced" *within* institutions to temporary faculty and teaching assistants. The actual cost-reductions realized by outsourcing are no doubt highly variable. More ambitious attempts to eliminate the lower division (freshman and sophomore years) of baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities have failed (for two efforts at Stanford, see Cuban, 1999), partly because of sentimental attachment to the "four year degree" as an institutional stamp, partly because of resistance of intercollegiate athletics and alumni, and, by now, because of the fact that the lower division provides the major sources of "employment" for graduate student teaching assistants. In a word, the talk and activity of unbundling seems more to confirm the *strength* of the accretion-bundling complex than it does its *reversal*.

The Discipline-based Academic Department: So Strong and Yet So Frail

One part of the great transformation of American higher education from the Civil War to the first decades of the twentieth century was the increased specialization of knowledge, both within existing areas of inquiry and by the appearance of new areas. These specializations moved from more diffuse areas of inquiry into "disciplines," connoting the production of knowledge on the basis of "disciplined" exploration of the subject matter by using an explicit and selective set of analytic assumptions and principles. These intellectual domains differed in rigor and completeness, and still do.

Irregularly but inevitably, the *organizational* embodiment of disciplines in the United States became the academic *department*, a largely autonomous sub-unit of faculty members in a discipline. This distinctive creation—Alain Touraine called the department "the great American invention" (1997 [1974], p. 33)—had its origins and its cousins in European systems of "faculties", but evolved, with variations, as a more collegial and less authoritarian model than those cousins. The "chairman"—now "chair"— even in its strongest manifestations, never reached the dictatorial dimensions of the chief, single "professor" in the German and other systems.

Despite this looseness, the department accumulated power over time and became the principal institutional reality of universities and colleges. Its constant feature is a defined, annually renewed budget and career lines. Its responsibilities have fanned out. Departments are mainly responsible for collegiate and post-graduate *curricula* and who teaches them; most "majors" are named after disciplines and administered by departments. Future professionals receive their *training* in discipline-based departments. Their professional *names*—physicist, geneticist, anthropologist—derive from this training. They find *employment* in discipline-based departments, and if they have not been certified in department-based training programs, they are scarcely employable

(who will hire a "natural scientist" or a "humanist" without further specification?). *Advances* in their careers (rank, tenure, pay increases) are initiated and largely controlled by departments, though this power is shared with the editors of journal and with publishers of books, as well research-granting agencies, whose decisions govern the main products on which academics are assessed (Bowen and Schwarz, 2005). Together the graduate training and employment systems form discrete *labor markets* for disciplines, more or less sealed off from other disciplines. And not least, once established, academic departments are notoriously difficult to *eliminate*, as administers have learned and know well; they are the quintessential accretions. The main budgetary victims in difficult, downsizing times are weaker experimental and interdisciplinary enterprises lacking the same structural and budgetary foundations. Departments can be squeezed but seldom strangled.

Other institutional arrangements more or less mirror this discipline-department core of colleges and universities. Most professional social scientists with the same disciplinary name are members of a national—and perhaps regional and international—association bearing the name of their disciplines: the American Political Science Association, for example. These associations act as status-protecting and status-enhancing groups and political lobbies. They hold annual meetings, which are simultaneously occasions for intellectual activity, recruitment, socializing, and ritual affirmation of identity and solidarity. Commercial and university publishers honor the disciplines by developing publication lists with disciplinary names—the psychology list, the history list, and so on. Governmental and foundation funders organize their giving in part by discipline-named programs and appoint program officers with disciplinary designations. Honorary and fellowship-awarding societies, such as the National Academy of Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, and the Guggenheim Foundation, organize their membership lists and categories of award-giving along disciplinary lines.

Thus, discipline-based departments persist as the lifeblood and seat of vested interests in institutions of higher education. From a social-psychological point of view, the facts that professionals describe themselves by disciplinary label, find their homes, and carry out their roles in discipline-based departments and associations mean that part of their personal and collective identities will be couched in a disciplinary frame. Departments are the structural bases for what have been called academic tribes with distinctive cultures—in-groups that write to, for, and against one another, and bear loves and hates for others (Becher, 1989). In everyday life faculty members remind themselves and others and are continuously reminded by others that they have such an identity. The fact that this institutional and personal identity is so pervasive contributes to the idea that disciplines are reified and described as *things* in our discourse.

Despite all these sources of solidity, the discipline-based department presents a number of dilemmas and frailties that are not fully appreciated—largely, perhaps because of the mentioned reification. I have noticed and reflected on these in my own career, and present them for your reflection:

- *The department as a force for expansion*. The budget of departments is determined by a process of annual request-and-justification for faculty and staff positions, office costs, and other expenditures. The chair presents (or is presented with) a budget and may enter a process of negotiation and adjudication with the administration. Expenses are controlled in this manner, but chairs, backed by their colleagues, exercise systematic pressure to expand or not be cut. One argument typically employed is that unless the department "covers the field" in teaching and research, it not only fails in its intellectual mission but also is also a lesser force in the national competitive arena. Relevant evidence: (a) Chairs of history departments are forever arguing, with fervor, that it is fatal for their entire program if Iberian history (or some other area) isn't covered. Administrators are continuously bombarded with this logic. (b) Multidisciplinary departments feel less favored because they believe that, if they were distinct, they would fare better competitively and be in a better position to expand. Joint departments of sociology and anthropology live under this tension, even if latent. One source of discontinuation of the famous Department of Social Relations at Harvard (1950-70) was restlessness on the part of its psychologists, anthropologists, and sociologists, based on the feeling that if they existed as separate departments they could compete better for faculty and resources than in their three-in-one arrangement. (c) Those departments that choose the strategy of developing strength by concentrating in delimited areas—small group research or criminology, for example—are seen to hobble themselves by not being able to "cover the field" and offering first-class *general* graduate training. All these factors generate self-protective or expansionist tendencies.

- *The weakness of the chair.* Given the "foreign-ness" of European dictatorial models, given the democratic thread in American society, and given the academic culture of "company of equals," it was probably fore-ordained that the chair would be a comparatively powerless position. Though there are exceptions (for example, chairs in medical schools), in general the chair is low on authority and high on persuasion, coddling, diplomacy, coordination, and conflict-management (Gmelch and Miskin, 1995). I served as chair of my department twice during my career, and from that I emerged with a working definition: "A department chair is a person that spends 80% of his or her time running errands on behalf of disagreeable colleagues." In retrospect I was wrong: 50% would be better, with 25% in dealing with

factions, 25% in paperwork.   Chairs carried much of the responsibility with respect to all aspects of affirmative action subsequent diversification efforts. When I was chair I also attended the annual meetings of sociology departmental chairs around the country; these gatherings tended to turn into group therapy sessions. I should add that departments with opportunities for external research funding experience an increase in individual faculty entrepreneurship and a decrease in collective faculty involvement in departmental life. Furthermore, the chair must continually negotiate with those researchers about teaching-time to be bought off and deal with the chronic headaches of maintaining the department's teaching commitments.

While historically necessary and perhaps the best of worlds on balance, the chairmanship presents problems of weakness and tedium for incumbents and problems of motivation for potential incumbents. Many faculty regard it as an onerous distraction from more important work (mainly research), with the result that some of the most active and outstanding researchers make a career of avoiding the office. Correspondingly, some deans make a career of beating the bushes for willing and able people—and not offensive to their colleagues—to take on the job.

- *Structure and culture of departments.* It is in the nature of scientific and scholarly activity to fragment and spread over time as new discoveries are made, new lines and sub-traditions of research develop, and new uses for knowledge become evident. New interdisciplinary initiatives flourish and hybrid fields are formed. Sometimes these are significant enough that they become the basis of additional structures—research programs, even departments such as astrophysics and neuroscience, or multidisciplinary organized research units. Sometimes by-passed fields, such as zoology or geography, partially disappear and are re-absorbed into other units.

  Despite these organizational adjustments, I must point to the fundamental structural rigidity of departments. This persists in the natural sciences even with the flexibility I just noted. In the social sciences and the humanities the rigidity is striking, with almost no change in disciplinary-departmental designation since they were introduced into higher education in the late nineteenth century. Yet all these fields show a continuing *intellectual* process of extension, diversification, and fragmentation. This means that the new directions are absorbed under one departmental roof. The consequences are paradigmatic incoherence in disciplines, more specialization, less comprehension of the whole discipline by its own members, and more internal conflict over priorities in faculty appointments and teaching responsibilities. Even in economics, which boasts greater paradigmatic unity than its sister social sciences, recent history has seen innumerable new subfields and preoccupations—development economics, agency theory, new institutional economics, and above all behavioral economics. All these are absorbed as sub-themes in economics departments and some become subsections in the professional associations. The appearance of new schools of thought and new intellectual emphases are forever pushing to extend the process. And while the long-standing subfields may undergo change, they seldom disappear altogether. All this is good news in that it reflects intellectual dynamism, but it creates problems of integration and synthesis of knowledge.

  I have referred to these dynamics as a *contradiction* between the rigidities of structure (the department) and the dynamics of culture (the discipline), which yields a picture of departmental overloading, competition and conflict over priorities, and disciplinary sprawl. This contradiction is a running sore that is continuously dealt with but seldom formally acknowledged.

The Organized Research Unit as Distraction from Departments.

Laurence Veysey (1965, p. 338) noted that the basic structure of the modern university was set in the early twentieth century with the consolidation of the research impulse and the academic department. The only subsequent structural innovation, he noted in a side comment, was the system of research centers or institutions, and these were expressions of the augmented research impulse.

An organized research unit is a university structure separate from an academic department. It is usually established as a response to an interest on the part of an external agency (foundation or government), which offers resources for some line of research to be launched and carried out. A recent instance is the creation of a number of research institutes on the study of different facets of terrorism, sponsored and financed by the Department of Homeland Security. Institutes and centers have a faculty director and an assemblage of affiliated faculty members (usually interdisciplinary), a physical location on or near the campus, and a supporting infrastructure. These units also have developed a staying power almost as strong as departments. Their director and affiliates are constituencies, believe in and proclaim the legitimacy of their efforts, and resist efforts to discontinue them. In a word, they, too, are accretions.

From the perspective of the academic department, the many research units on campuses provide alternate homes and foci of identification for its members. Typically though not always their research grants are administered through organized research units; this includes recruiting and hiring research assistants. These units also often provide clerical and staff support that is more generous than that available in departments. Since they are more intellectually focused than departments, the faculty member may find that his or her interests mesh more comfortably with others in research units than they do with departmental colleagues. Research units are also the setting for working groups, seminars, colloquia, and conferences, though they do not offer formal courses. All these add up to the fact that, in addition to being intellectual supplements to departments, research units are also *competitors* with departments for loci of research, time spent, and intellectual commitment. Aware of this, I once described the academic department as an emptying residual, a place where the chair negotiates over what and how much faculty teach, and an arena in which colleagues fight over who gets hired and who does not. Perhaps it is not too much to say that departments have been hollowed out as intellectual communities, but retain vitality as political entities. These are oversimplifications at best, but they take note of the fact that academic departments and organized research units are in some respects at cross-purposes in the knowledge arena—a point whose extent and significance are not fully appreciated.

Reactions and Conflicts Endemic in the Process of Accretion

Numerous commentators have noted a paradox of extremes in American higher education.   It experiences simultaneous love and hate. It is asserted to be the best in world and but at the same time is assaulted on multiple fronts. Altbach observed that "at the same time that American academe has come in for unprecedented criticism at home, it is widely emulated abroad" (2001, p. 11). During the last 1990s I served on an international body called the German-American Academic Council, composed of about two-dozen scholars, civil servants, and political leaders from both countries. A consistent theme was that the German members could find much to praise about the American system (especially its political decentralization and competition among universities), and almost nothing to praise about their own. In the meantime, the American members appeared to be noncommittal about the German system but quick to criticize their own on many counts. This anomaly produced a number dialogues between the deaf.

I would like to develop this anomaly—this theme of ambivalence—further. In doing so I will first enunciate a little model that has served me well as a scholar of social change.   It goes as follows:

Social change typically has both destructive and constructive aspects. Schumpeter's (1934) notion of "creative destruction" captures the process. Industrial technology and its reorganization of the division of labor eliminated less efficient forms of production and introduced new ones. Computers replaced typewriters, cell-phones crowd out landlines. The rise of democracy partially erased earlier forms of political life and established new principles of authority and political participation. Secularization eroded traditional religious cultures and ushered in new legitimizing cultural ideologies. This principle, while general, is usually not an all-or-none matter. Residues of past cultures and structures survive, and in some cases changes involve accretions—superimposing new arrangements on old ones. In all events, it seems inevitable from this double aspect that circumstantial change is greeted with ambivalence—both welcomed and resented. In addition, the human mind is sufficiently agile—or unruly, if you will—that one consequence of circumstantial change is that those affected by it select one side of this double-aspect, generalize and extrapolate from it, and create runaway scenarios that result in predictions of both positive utopias (Pangloss) or negative ones (Cassandra).

To choose some general examples: film, radio, telephone, and television were hailed by some as world-shaking revolution that would create a whole new world of efficiency in communication; for example, Thomas Edison said in 1913 that with the invention of film, "our school system will be completely changed in the next ten years" (quoted in Stokes, 2011, p. 201). Others bemoaned their destruction of interpersonal intimacy and the end of confidentiality. Neither consequence was realized. The advent of radio and television brought predictions of the end of attendance at athletic events, and television promised the end of attendance at the movies. Early reactions to the computer crystallized into idealized views of the magic of the information society and predictions about the disappearance of meaningful social life (Streeter, 2004). The e-mail and the web have been proclaimed as both liberating and addictive. To choose more cosmic examples: Malthusian predictions of starvation and disaster accompanied the rosy glow of the idea of progress during the industrial revolution; Marxian predictions combined both a negative utopia (the excesses of capitalism) and a positive one (the perfection of communism) into one ideology. The darkness of environmental predictions of spoliation, destruction, and exhaustion are countered by scientific and economic arguments that new technologies will overcome the negative effects of old technologies. The lesson to be learned is that humans' assessments of their own histories and situations include not only realism but also galloping extensions of absolutes to create imaginary worlds of both utopian bliss and Chicken Little disaster. This lesson should impart a note of caution if not distrust in those extreme predictions.

The social sciences themselves reveal have a long history of the Panglossian-Cassandrian syndrome. Anyone familiar with the literatures of industrial and economic development, urbanization, and community life will find these dual tendencies, the one

extreme basking in the effects of prosperity, urbanity, and human betterment, the other bemoaning the impoverishment, depersonalization, and injustices. Sensible scholars of these phenomena find mixtures of all these effects in complex patterns of change.

I submit to you that the history of higher education—perhaps education in general—has been especially productive of the Panglossian-Cassandrian syndrome. Clark Kerr made a partial reference to this phenomenon when he observed, from his own experience at celebratory occasions, "what I have come to experience references to a glorious past and to a fearsome future" (Kerr, 1963, p. 211). His remark caught a part of my analysis. What I want to do is to give a more complex account, and to argue that is inextricably mixed with the phenomenon of accretion I am stressing. Let me produce a few historical illustrations:

- The nineteenth century, especially its last third, marked what is agreed to be perhaps the greatest transition in American higher education—a drift from an emphasis on received religious truths to the search for knowledge in general; a steady conquest of scientific emphases over religious ones; the incorporation sciences into curricula; the Humboldtian view of research and the consolidation of specialized knowledge; and postgraduate degrees and professional schools. All these meant the death knell for the early nineteenth-century college. As Ruben (1996) has documented, however, the whole process was accompanied by punctuated counter-statements: periodic, nostalgic reassertions of the sacred value of religious and moral education. Then, at the beginning of the twentieth century a full-fledged counter-movement developed. Here is how she summarizes the situation:

  > By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century criticism of higher education had become so commonplace, one educator quipped, that "nobody has a good word to say for the college." After decades of belittling the old-style college, a new note of nostalgia entered public discourse about higher education. Commentators [for example, Nicholas Murray Butler] missed the unity, moral purpose and high ideals of the classical college. They perceived the new universities as chaotic and materialistic, and their students as selfish and undisciplined. This criticism escalated over the next decade, growing as universities' various efforts to keep knowledge and morality united in a modern form of moral education failed (*ibid*., p. 230; see also Veysey, 1965).

  All the ingredients of my "model" of transitional conflict are there: dismissal of an archaic past and glorification of a brave new world by the riders of the crest of change; and glorification of a treasured past and dread of ruination by the apparently conquering wave of change. In fully developed form, such conflicts involve the evocation of four utopias, two positive and two negative, two past and two future, arrayed in juxtaposition to one another. These utopias differ, of course, as to how explicit and how fully developed they are.

- I interpret the wave of anti-vocationalism of the first third of the twentieth century—voiced most forcefully by the powerful voices of Thorstein Veblen and Robert Hutchins—and the ideal systems of truth-seeking that envisioned to save a vanishing world. In 1909 John Chapman moaned that "[the] men who control [universities] are very little else than businessmen" (quoted in Aronowitz, 2000, p. 17). Hutchins claimed that "[the pursuit of knowledge for its own place is being rapidly obscured [by vocationalism] in universities and may soon be extinguished" (1936, p. 36). Veblen announced simply that said that a college of commerce is "incompatible with the collective cultural purpose of the university. It belongs in the corporation of learning no more than a department of athletics" (1968 [1918], p. 154). The anti-vocational theme has continued noisily up to the present (for example, Aronowitz, 2000, whose subtitle reveals both a negative and a positive utopia: "Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning.")

- Immediately after World War II, as Congress was moving toward the historic passage of the GI bill, some opposing voices of college and administrators to this almost-universally approved measures were heard, complaining that the flood of these "non-traditional" students would constitute a threat to the values of isolation and pastoral bliss of their idealized campuses (Thelin, 2004a, p. 263).

- I will note later the opposition to the innovations that were being pressed with the support of philanthropic foundations earlier in the twentieth centuries—mainly on the theme that these foundations, expressing corporate values—were going to supplant the traditional values of academe in corporate directions.

- The long-term march of and conquest of research among the rewarded activities of university life has created periodic periods of protest and proclamations that liberal-education in particular and undergraduate education in general has been denuded or destroyed. At the end of the federal bonanza of research support by the federal government in the 1960s Nisbet (1971) complained of its degradation and corruption of academic values. The very influential manifesto

by Boyer (1990) in the wake of a flood of bashing colleges and universities for their educational failures in the 1980s (Bennett, 1984; National Institute of Education, 1984; Association of American Universities, 1985) is perhaps the most notable. A more recent critic has declared a "great ripoff" by universities, and proclaimed that "[t]he research emphasis versus the teaching emphasis is at the heart of the deterioration of undergraduate education in America" (Scarlett, 2004, p. 39; see also Tussman, 1997). There is some truth in these declarations, but at the moment I point only to the their absolute and unqualified features.

- The rise of on-line instruction shows a similar bifurcation of reactions. On the one hand, we learn that "DIY [Do It Yourself] education promises [an] evolution from expensive institutions to expansive networks; it aims to fulfill the promise of universal education, but only by leaving the university behind" (Kamanetz, 2010, p. 119). Another enthusiast asserts that the "disruptive innovation" of computer learning "will change the way the world learns" (Christensen, et al., 2011). It is "destroying the traditional classroom and replacing it with an even better way to learn and teach (William Draves, quoted in Stokes, 2011, p. 197). At the same time we notice a widespread feeling among academics—a feeling combining denial and dread—that on-line education is a denigration if not a corruption of traditional modes of education; "[the] new technology of education . . . robs faculty of their knowledge and skills, their control over their working lives, the product of their labor, and ultimately, their means of livelihood" (David Noble, quoted in Stokes, p. 198).

- In keeping with larger trends, the 1980s saw an upsurge of an "accountability mania" in industry and in federal and state governments—more on this in the third lecture.   This also spread to academia. One of its ingredients was to develop "performance indicators" such as test scores of graduating students, graduation rates, and job placement. Reactions to this also bifurcated. An Australian team of academic administrators noted in 1998 that:

> Something resembling a . . . cult seems to have grown up around the notion of performance indicators, so that all manner of powers and virtues are ascribed to them and expectations are aroused by citing their great benefits and miraculous results" (quoted in Teather, 1993, p. 103).

In the meantime administrators and faculty were assaulting these and other measures of performance not only as methodologically flawed when applied to academic institutions, but as fatal threats to academic autonomy, institutional trust, and even academic freedom (below, pp. 00-00). More generally, some authors have commented on "management fads" that rise and fade in academia as elsewhere—zero-based budgeting, benchmarking, total quality management, and business process business process reengineering.

These innovations reveal common features: a narrative and rhetoric of their own, with magical problem-solving or revolutionary potential (Birnbaum, 2000). The ideas are diffused and disseminated in a definite pattern, which is inevitably temporary. Insofar as these innovations are accompanied by assertions that a crisis is at hand and a cure is in sight, they are simultaneously Cassandrian and Panglossian.

Conditions Producing the Endemic Pattern
To conclude the current discussion, I mention three factors—simultaneously causal and reinforcing—of this Panglossian-Cassandrian process that accompanies changes in the structure of higher education.

- Earlier I mentioned the distinctive moral embeddedness of higher education. That context provides a special type of cognitive-evaluative frame, encouraging the tendency to define issues in extreme, totalistic, and good-and-evil terms. The prospect of the disappearance of the old is regarded alternatively as good riddance or tragic loss; the arrival of the new is regarded alternatively as defilement or new-world-creating. Moreover, the moral mental set is conducive to various types of one-factor, simplistic thinking, and does not welcome contingent, conditional, and qualified assessments.

- I also mentioned the special strength of inertial tendencies among academics, and their highly honed capacity—both psychological and organizational—to block changes in valued aspects of their way of life. One of the most effective strategies of resistance is to escalate them to an expression of high-minded principle, which is consistent with both the moralistic and the arrogant tendencies of much of academic culture. This strategy also produces extremes.

- Closely related, we should note the considerable rhetoric power that lies in the language of alarm, crisis, and salvation. In particular, the language of crisis is typically not only a description of a state of affairs, but also a "dramaturgic term, suggesting urgent problems that require immediate heroic solutions" (Donaghue, 2008, p. 1). As such, it is a

mobilizing device. "The rhetoric of crisis does not seek to further analysis, but to promote action and advance the priority of an issue on the always-overcrowded public policy agenda" (Birnbaum and Sushok, 2001, p. 70). It aims to accomplish this purpose by developing a history and narrative that highlights the exceptional, the threatening, and the urgent. It is of additional persuasive value to generalize the rhetoric and to claim that the crisis is fundamental and moral, not merely technical or practical. Because the language of crisis is overused historically, because so many proclaimed crises turn out not to be crises, and because the language of crisis becomes deflated as a result, a further rhetorical device emerges: to claim that the crisis at hand is a "real crisis," acknowledging tacitly the unreality of past ones.

- The language of crisis and evocation of extremes rests, finally, on the presence of a pervasive mythology among many academics: nostalgia for an imagined past reality of the university as a happy mix of the principles of collegiality, common commitment to a calling, and a company of equals. I sometimes experience those feelings myself.

I will return to this theme of ambivalence in the final chapter when I resume assess special topics such as part-time academic employment, commercialization, and for-profit enterprises. To telegraph that discussion, I will attempt to move away from the pattern of extremes of ambivalence and produce more textured and complex accounts that are perhaps less intellectually and emotionally satisfying but more in keeping with current realities.

Two Long-term Consequences of Accretion.
In these lectures I posit that many additional features of university life trace to and reflect the fundamental phenomenon of accretion.

The Structuring of Faculty Activities
As functions and structures are accumulated, two primary consequences for faculty life are:

- Personal workload increases and becomes more diversified. More activities are added when the academic becomes more than a teacher, evaluator of students, advisor, and role model. He or she is now called upon to conduct research of high quality; to manage a laboratory or a group of research assistants; to write letters of recommendation for students; to apply for grants; to file reports on research activity; to spend more time in evaluating research grant proposals for foundations and government funding agencies; to consult with community groups, foundations, and government; to attend conferences and congresses; and to spend more time in the air. (Jacques Barzun (1968) wrote of "academics in orbit," and we used to jest that Berkeley faculty conformed to the policy of the Strategic Air Command—one professor in the air at all times.). Surveys of university faculty consistently show that they work 50-60 or more hours per week. Many factors go into these figures—for example, that no amount of scientific and scholarly output is "enough" in the struggle for status and esteem—but I would attribute them mainly to the accretion and fragmentation of their work activities. The increasingly complex "bundle" created by accretion fosters a correspondingly complex "bundle" of university-related activities on the part of its individual faculty members. At least one handbook focuses on strategies for juggling faculty time and attention (Bianco-Mathis and Chalofsky, 1999). Some researchers have attempted to demonstrate that role overload and role conflict are sources of psychological stress among academics (Fisher, 1994).

    I noticed this phenomenon directly when I was a visiting professor on the campus of Illinois State University (Bloomington-Normal) in the spring of 2006. For a number of years the institution had been sending messages to its faculty that research activities (mainly journal articles and research reports) were going to be given more attention in their advancement and promotion. Yet I also noticed (and commented in a brief article in a campus publication) that no corresponding reduction in teaching activities had been enacted or contemplated.

- With this increased pressure on faculty, the long-term tendencies to increase the size of student bodies on campuses, and the astronomical increase in funding that would be required to assign regular faculty to teach those numbers, several lines of *differentiation* of the faculty role have made their appearance. One line has been the growth of curriculum and career advisors in the administration, who gradually assume responsibility for one traditional activity (student advising) toward which faculty had become both indifferent and ineffective—but still formally responsible—over the years. The addition of psychotherapy and counseling to student health services was a further transfer of faculties' responsibilities as moral authorities. More importantly, I refer to the expansion in numbers and responsibilities of teaching assistants (graduate lab and section leaders and exam evaluators), undergraduate "readers" of exams, part-time graduate and some undergraduate research assistants; non-faculty research personnel (hired mainly through research institutes on "soft" grant monies), and appointments of both full-time and part-time

lecturers and instructors (of which we will hear more later). All of these classes are ancillary to the tenure-track faculty and reflect the partial renunciation of traditional faculty responsibilities. Three features characterize these classes:

(a)   Ancillaries tend to increase during periods of rapid expansion; in the frantic days of growth of students and research opportunities in the period between 1950 and 1970, for example, their numbers exploded, while growth rates of "regular" faculty were very modest by comparison (Smelser, 1974). Paradoxically, as we will see later, the very same classes, contingent faculty especially, also tend to expand in institutional hard times, but by a different dynamic—administrative economizing and achieving flexibility in curricular offerings.

b)   While these groups were assigned to undertake some core *activities* of teaching and research, the faculties as established elites of the university were reluctant to relinquish *control* of them or to compromise the claim that the faculty remained the academic heart, soul, and conscience of their institutions. This was accomplished by several mechanisms. Approval of curricula and courses remained largely in control of designated faculty committees; faculty kept formal responsibility for evaluating students and signed and legitimized their grade sheets; the role of "principal investigator" in sponsored research was restricted to regular faculty members, thus limiting independent initiatives on the part of non-faculty research personnel, except informally; non-faculty research personnel could teach only on an incidental basis and with approval by faculty committees. All the ancillary categories were excluded from membership in academic senates and councils, shared governance, and symbolically important privileges such as parking. All this represents a classical example of elites' delegating responsibility but not power and privilege—incidentally, also, an important source of political alienation.

These processes expectably produced several classes of second-class citizens in the university community. Each class participates in the core functions of the institution but is denied the power, prestige, and honor of those who control those functions. Administrative advisers and consultants to students are consigned to that category of "staff," many of whom are convinced that they really run the university, and whom many faculty members ignore when they do their job well and are quick to blame when they appear not to do so. Non-faculty research personnel sometimes engage, usually unsuccessfully, for academic senate membership, faculty privilege, and formal teaching (*ibid*.). (I once defined a university as an arena in which the faculty spend most of their time successfully avoiding teaching and non-faculty researchers spends most of their time unsuccessfully agitating to teach.) A further expression of status dissatisfaction is that the most active arenas for faculty unionization in recent decades has been among contingent faculty members and teaching assistants, not regular faculty (below, pp. 00-00).

Implications for Academic Community
The changes of academic community occasioned by accretion are by now so evident that they require little demonstration. The main mechanisms have been:

- The sheer size of the faculties of major universities. With 2,000 or more "colleagues," a professor can pass through a whole career on his or her own campus without meeting, much less getting to know, more than a small percentage of them. Large numbers also dictates corresponding increases in social distance and superficiality between faculty and administrators and faculty and students.

- Increased specialization and fragmentation. This has been accomplished through the growth in numbers and "silo-ization" of discipline-based departments with specialized languages and interests, as well as "internal silo-ization" of these departments as their subject matter specializes and sprawls.

- The addition of many ancillary, especially non-academic, activities and programs, created diversity and tended to turn the university into an aggregate of programs and activities with little organic relationship to one another.   Even early in the twentieth century one commentator could speak of the campus as an aggregation of incompatibles—"a combination of sporting resort, beer garden, political convention, laboratory, and factory for research as confused as a Spanish omelet" (Canby, 1936, p. 81; for a more recent version of the same observation, see Geiger, 2004, p. 15). This aggravated enduring cleavages and conflicts over priorities, most notably the long-standing tension between academics and athletics as well as academics and partying.

- The creation of research-fund-seeking faculty entrepreneurs leads to individualizing and separating effects, as individual faculty members reach out externally to different sponsors of research.

- The domination of discipline-based research drives faculty identification toward professional associations and disciplinary brethren in other institutions and away from identification with home institution. Sir Eric Ashby spoke of a crisis of identity: "the modern academic suffers a divided loyalty between the university he serves and the professional guild (of chemists or historians and so on) to which he belongs." (1974, p. 73). Internationalization of disciplines only extends the problem, as do opportunities for rapid electronic communication outside the community and nation.

What university community remains is "a whole series of communities" (Kerr, 1963, p. 1), and perhaps a residual general community that is largely imagined or supposed, and proclaimed on ceremonial occasions by campus leaders and governing boards, at athletic events, and in times of political crisis. If I may end this lecture on a personal, somewhat ironic note, I confess that I often feel that my university is a community, that I am a member of it, and that I love it as a community. Those feelings are genuine enough, but I do not, I think, take the next step and delude myself into a view that that community really exists.

REFERENCES

Alfred, Richard Christopher Shults, Ozan Jaquette, and Shelley Strickland
    2009   Community Colleges on the Horizon: Challenge, Choice, or Abundance. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Allen , Mark (ed.)
    2002   The Corporate University Handbook: Designing, Managing, and Growing a Successful Program. New York: AMACOM.
Altbach, Philip G.
    2001   "The American Academic Model in Comparative Perspective," in
                Philip G. Altbach, Patricia Gumport and D. Bruce Johnstone (eds.),
                In Defense of American Higher Education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns
                Hopkins University Press. Pp. 11-37.
Amacher, Ryan C. and Roger E. Meiners
    2004   Faulty Towers: Tenure and the Structure of Higher Education.
                Oakland, CA: The Independent Institute.
American Council on Education
    2007   The American College President. Washington, DC: American Council
                on Education.
Anderson, Martin
    1992   Imposters in the Temple: American Intellectuals are Destroying Our
                Universities and Cheating Our Students of Their Future. New York:
                Simon and Schuster.
Archibald Robert B. and David H. Feldman
    2011   Why Does College Cost So Much? Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Aronowitz, Stanley
    2000   The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and
                Creating True Higher Learning. Boston: Beacon Press.
Ashby, Eric
    1974   Adapting Universities to a Technological Society. San Francisco, CA;
                Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Association of American Colleges
    1985   Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic
                Academic Community. Washington, DC: Association of American
                Colleges.
Balderston, Frederick
    1974   Managing Today's Universities. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
                Publishers.
Baldwin, Roger G. and Jay L. Chronister
    2002   "What Happened to the Tenure Track?" in Richard P. Chait (ed.),
                The Questions of Tenure. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
                Pp. 125-59.
Barr, Margaret J. and George S. McClellan
    2011   Budgets and Financial Management in Higher Education. San
                Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Barzun, Jacques
    1968   The American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going. New York:
                Harper and Row.
Bate, Jonathan
    2011   "Finding Public Value." Oxford Today. 24(1):30-31.
Becher, Tony
    1989   Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the
                Cultures of Disciplines. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
Benjamin, Ernst
    1998   "Variation in the Characteristics of Part-Time Faculty by General
                Fields of Instruction and Research," in David W. Leslie (ed.),

            The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty: Understanding Causes
            Causes and Effects, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Pp.
            45-60.
Bennett, William J.
      1984   To Reclaim a Legacy: Report on the Humanities in Higher Education.
            Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities.
Berdahl, Robert M.
      2008   "Developed Universities and the Developing World: Opportunities and
            Obligations," in Luc E. Weber and James J. Duderstadt (eds.), The
            Globalization of Higher Education. London: Economica. Pp. 45-53.
Berry, Joe
      2005   Reclaiming the Ivory Tower: Organizing Adjunct to Change Higher Education. New York: Monthly Review Press.
Bettinger, Eric P. and Bridget Terry Long
      2007   "Remedial and Developmental Courses," in Stacy Dickert-Conlin and
            Ross Rubenstein (eds.), Economic Inequality and Higher Eductation;
            Access, Persistence, and Success. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
            Pp. 69-100.
Bianco-Mathis, Virginia and Neal Chalofsky (eds.)
      1999   The Full-Time Faculty Handbook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Birnbaum, Robert
      2000   Management Fads in Higher Education: Where They Come From,
            What They Do, Why They Fail. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Birnbaum, Robert and Frank Shushok, Jr.
      2001   "The 'Crisis' Crisis in Higher Education: Is That a Wolf or a Pussycat
            at the Academy's Door?" in Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumport, and D. Bruce Johnstone (eds.),
            In Defense of American Higher Education.
            Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 59-84.
Blakemore, Colin
      2011   "Fearful Asymmetry." Oxford Today. 24(1):32-33.
Bok, Derek
      2003   Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher
            Education. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Bourdieu, Pierre
      1988   Homo Academicus (translated by Peter Collier). Cambridge: Polity
            Press.
Bowen, Howard R.
      1980   The Costs of Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Bowen, William M. and Michael Schwarz
      2005   The Chief Purposes of Universities: Academic Discourse and the
            Diversity of Ideas. Lewiston, ME: The Edwin Mellen Press.
Bowie, Norman E.
      1994   University-Business Partnerships: An Assessment. Lanham, MD:
            Roman and Littlefield.
Boyer, Ernest L.
      1990   Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate. Princeton,
            NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Brewer, Dominic J., Susan M. Gates, and Charles A. Goldman
      2002   In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in US Higher
            Education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
Brint, Steven
      2011 "The Educational Lottery," in Los Angeles Review of Books, November
            15. Pp. 1-15.
Brint, Steven and Jerome Karabel
      1989   The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of
            Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985. New York: Oxford
            University Press.
Brubacher, John S.
      1978   On the Philosophy of Higher Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-
            Bass Publishers.
Burke, Joseph J.
      1999   "Multicampus Systems: The Challenge of the Nineties," in Gerald H.
            Gaither (ed.), The Multicampus System: Perspectives on Practice
            and Prospects. Sterling, VA: Stylus. Pp. 40-79.
Canby, Henry Seidel
      1936   Alma Mater: The Gothic Age of the American College. New York:
            Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
Chait, Richard P.
      2002a   "Why Tenure? Why Now?' in Richard P. Chait (ed.), The Questions
            of Tenure. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 7-31.
Chait, Richard P.
      2002b   "Does Faculty Governance Differ at Colleges with Tenure and
             Colleges without Tenure?" in Richard P. Chait (ed.), The Questions of Tenure.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 69-100.

Chancellor's Blue Ribbon Commission on Inter Collegiate Athletics
    1991   "Intercollegiate Athletics at Berkeley." Berkeley, CA: University
        of California, Berkley.

Cheit, Earl F.
    1971   The New Depression in Higher Education: A Study of Financial
        Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cheit, Earl F.
    1985   "Business Schools and Their Critics," Business and Public Policy
        Working Paper #BBP-5, Working Papers, University of California
        Business School. Berkeley, CA: Regents of the University of
        California.

Christensen, Clayton, Michael B. Horn, and Curtis W. Johnson
    2011   Disrupting Class: How Disruptive Innovation Will Change the
        Way the World Learns. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cohen, Linda and Roger G. Noll
    1998   "Universities, Constituencies, and the Role of the States," in Roger G.
        Noll (ed.), Challenges to Research Universities. Washington, DC:
        Brookins Institution Press. Pp. 31-62.

Cohen, Wesley M., Richard Florida, Lucien Randazzese, and John Walsh
    1998   "Industry and the Academy: Uneasy Partners in the Cause of
        Technological Advance," in Roger G. Noll (ed.), Challenges to Research Universities.
        Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1998. Pp. 171-99.

Collinge, Alan
    2009   The Student Loan Scam: The Most Oppressive Debt in U.S. History—
        and How We Can Fight Back. Boston: Beacon Press.

Cuban, Larry
    1999   How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change Without Reform in
        University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890-1990.
        New York: Teachers College Press.

Darden, Mary Landon, with Robert B. Cloud
    2009   "Future Legal Issues," in Mary Landon Dardon, Beyond 2020: Envisioning the Future of
        Universities in America. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp. 47-62.

Darden, Mary Landon, with James J. Duderstadt
    2009   "Overview of the Future University Beyond 2020," in Mary Landon
        Dardon, Beyond 2020: Envisioning the Future of Universities in
        America. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp. 1-12.

Darden, Mary Landon, with James G. Neal
    2009   "University Libraries of the Future," in Mary Landon
        Dardon, Beyond 2020: Envisioning the Future of Univesities in
        America. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp. 113-21.

D'Augelli, Anthony R.
    1991   "Teaching Lesbian and Gay Development: A Pedagogy of the
        Oppressed," in William G, Tierney (ed.), Culture and Ideology
        in Higher Educaiton: Advancing a Critical Agenda. New York:
        Praeger. Pp. 213-33.

De Cew, Judith Wagner
    2003   Unionization in the Academy: Visions and Realities. Lanham, MD:
        Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Donague, Frank
    2008   The Last Professors: the Corporate University and the Fate of the
        Humanities. New York: Fordham University Press.

Dong, Nelson G.
    1995   "University-Industry Symbiosis: The Passing of an Era?" BIOTECH '95.
        San Francisco, CA: American Law Institute/American Bar Association.

Douglass, John Aubrey
    2000   The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960
        Master Plan. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Duderstadt, James J.
    2000   A University for the 21st Century. Ann Arbor: The University of
        Michigan Press.

Durkheim, Émile
    1997   The Division of Labor in Society. With an Introduction by Lewis A.
    [1893]
        Coser, translated by W. D. Halls. New York: The Free Press.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G.
    2011   "Rethinking the Professoriate," in Ben Wildawsky, Andrew P. Kelly,
        and Kevin Carey (eds.), Reinventing Higher Education: The Promise
        of Innovation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 101-28.

El-Khawas, Elaine
    2005   "The Push for Accountability: Policy Influences and Actors in
        American Higher Education," in Ase Gornitzka, Maurice Kogan,

and Alberto Amaral, Reform and Change in Higher Education:
Analyzing Policy Implementation. Dordrecht, The Netherlands:
Springer. Pp. 287-303.

Engell, James and Anthony Dangerfield
2005   Saving Higher Education in the Age of Money. Charlottesville , VA:
University of Virginia Press.

Farrington, Gregory C.
1999   "The New Technologies and the Future of Residential Undergraduate
Education," in Richard N. Katz and Associates (eds.), Dancing with the
Devil: Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher
Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Pp. 73-94.

Fecher, R. J. (ed.)
1985   Applying Corporate Management Strategies. San Francisco, CA:
Jossey-Bass.

Fisher, James L
1989   "Establishing a Successful Fund-Raising Program," in James L. Fisher
and Gary H. Quehl, The President and Fund Raising.   New York:
Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989. Pp. 3-17.

Fisher, James L. and James V. Koch
2004   The Entrepreneurial College President. Westport, CT: Praeger
Publishers.

Fisher, Shirley
1994   Stress in Academic Life: The Mental Assembly Line. Buckingham, UK:
The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open
University Press.

Flawn, Peter T.
1990   A Primer for University Presidents: Managing the Modern University.
Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Gaither, Gerald, Brian P. Nedwek, and John E. Neal
1994   Measuring Up: The Promises and Pitfalls of Performance Indicators
in Higher Education. Washington, DC: Graduate School of Education
and Human Development, the George Washington University.

Gaither, Gerald H.
1995   "Editor's Notes," in Gerald H. Gaither (ed.), Assessing Performance in
an Age of Accountability. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Pp. 1-3.

Gaither, Gerald H.
1999   "Preface," in Gerald H. Gaither (ed.) in The Multicampus System:
Perspectives on Practice and Prospects. Sterling, VA: Stylus. Pp. xviii-xxvi.

Gappa, Judith M. and David W. Leslie
1993   The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher
Education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Geiger, Roger L.
1986   To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research
Universities, 1900-1940. New York: Oxford University Press.

Geiger, Roger L.
2004   Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of
the Marketplace. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ginsburg, Benjamin
2011   The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-administrative University
and Why it Matters. New York: Oxford University Press.

Giroux, Henry A.
2007   The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial
Complex. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Gmelch, Walter H and Val D. Miskin
1995   Chairing an Academic Department. Thousand Oaks, C: Sage
Publications.

Gregorian, Vartan and James Martin
2004   "Presidents who Leave, Presidents Who Stay: A Conversation with
Vartan Gregorian," in James Martin, James El Samels & Associates,
Presidential Transition in Higher Education: Managing Leadership
Change. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 21-
28.

Griffith, Marlene and Ann Connor
1994   Democracy's Open Door: The Community College in America's Future.
Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Grizzle, Gloria
2002   "Performance Measurement and Dysfunction: The Dark Side of Quantifying Work."
Public Performance and Management Review, 25:363-69

Gross, John G. and Edie N. Goldenberg

2009   Off-Track Profs: Non-tenured Teachers in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
Gumport, Patricia
        1991   "The Research Imperative," in William G, Tierney (ed.), Culture and Ideology in Higher
                Education: Advancing a Critical Agenda. New York:
                Praeger. Pp. 87-105.
Hacker, Andrew and Claudia Dreifus
        2010   Higher Education?: How Colleges are Wasting our Money and Failing
                Our Kids—and What We Can Do About It. New York: Henry Holt and
                Company.
Hartnett, Rodney T.
        1971   Accountability in Higher Education: A Consideration of the Problems
                of Assessing College Impacts. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
Hayes, Dennis and Robin Wynyard (eds.)
        2002   The McDonaldization of Higher Education. Westport, CT: Bergin &
                Garvey.
Hearn, Thomas K.
        2006   "Leadership and Teaching in the American University," in David Brown (ed.),
                University Presidents as Moral Leaders. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers. Pp. 159-76.
Hentschke, Guilbert C., Vicent M. Lechuga, and William G. Tierney (eds.)
        2010   For-Profit Colleges and Universities: Their Markets, Regulation,
                Performance, and Place in Higher Education. Sterling, VA: Stylus
                Publishing.
Hernon, Peter and Robert E. Dugan
        2004   "Preface," in Peter Hernon and Robert E. Dugan (eds.), Outcomes
                Assessment in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
                Pp. xv-xvii.
Hook, Sidney
        1971   "The Long View," in Sidney Hook (ed.), In Defense of Academic Freedom. New York: Pegasus. Pp. 11-20.
Hughes, R. M.
        1925   A Study of the Graduate Schools of America. Oxford, OH: Miami University Press.
Hutcheson, Philo A.
        2000   A Professional Professoriae: Unionization, Bureaucratization, and
                the AAUP. Nashville, TN: The Vanderbilt University Press.
Hutchins, Robert Maynard
        1936   The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Hutti, Marianne, Gale S. Rhodes, Joni Allison and Evelyn Lauterbach
        1993   "The Part-time Faculty Institute: Strategically Designed and
                Continually Assessed," in Judith Gappa and David Leslie (eds.),
                The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-timers in Higher
                Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Pp. 31-48.
Jacobs, Frederic
        1998   "Using Part-time Faculty More Effectively," in David W. Leslie (ed.),
                in David W. Leslie (ed.), The Growing Use of Part-Time Faculty:
                Understanding Causes and Effects. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
                Pp. 9-18.
Jencks, Christopher and David Reisman
        1968   The Academic Revolution. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Johnstone, D. Bruce
        1999   "Management and Leadership Challenges of Multicampus Systems,"
                in Gerald H. Gaither (ed.) in The Multicampus System: Perspectives on Practice and Prospects.
                Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers. Pp. 3-20.
Johnstone, D. Bruce
        2001   "Higher Education and Those 'Out-of-Control Costs," in Philip G.
                Altbach, Patricia Gumport and D. Bruce Johnstone (eds.), In Defense of Higher Education.
                Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 144-65.
Kamenetz, Anya
        2010   DIY U: Edupunks, Edupreneurs, and the Coming Transformation of
                Higher Education. White River Junction, NH: Chelsea Green
                Publishing.
Kauffman, Joseph F.
        1993   "Supporting the president and Assessing the Presidency," in Richard
                T. Ingram and Associates, Governing Public Colleges and Universities:
                A Handbook for Trustees, Chief Executives and Other Campus Leaders.
                San Franciscco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Pp. 126-46.
Kay, John
        2000   "So We Agree Not to Agree?" Times Higher Education Supplement,
                November 24.

Keller, George
        1983   Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher
                Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
Kemperer, Ken

1991   "Understanding Cultural Conflict," in William G, Tierney (ed.),
              Culture and Ideology in Higher Education: Advancing a Critical Agenda.
              New York: Praeger. Pp. 129-50.

Kerr, Clark
1963   The Uses of the University. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.

Kerr, Clark
2001   Academic Triumphs, Vol. 1 of The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir of the
              University of California, 1949-1967. Berkeley, CA:
              The University of California Press.

Kerr, Clark
2003   Political Turmoil, Vol. 2 of The Gold and the Blue: A Personal Memoir
              of the University of California, 1949-1967. Berkeley, CA: The
              University of California Press.

Kimball, Bruce A.
2009   The Inception of Modern Professional Education: C. C. Langdell, 1926-
              1906. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

King, C. Judson
2009   "University Roles in Technological Innovation in California," in
              John Audrey Douglass, C. Judson King, and Irwin Feller (eds.),
              Globalization's Muse: Universities and Higher Education Systems in a
              Changing World. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Public Policy Press. Pp. 279-
              98.

Kinser, Kevin
2006   From Main Street to Wall Street: The Transformation of For-Profit
              Higher Education. ASHE Higher Education Report, Vol. 31, No. 5.
              Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

Kirp, David L
2003   Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher
              Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kirp, David L.
2005   "This Little Student Went to Market," in Richard H. Hersh and John
              Merrow (eds.), Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk. New
              York: Palgrave McMillan. Pp. 113-29.

Kirwan, William E.
2006   "The Morality of Shared Responsibility: Preserving Quality through
              Program Elimination," in David Brown (ed.), University Presidents
              as Moral Leaders. Westport, CN: Praeger Publishers. Pp. 147-55.

Klatt, Heinz-Joachim
2003   "Political Correctness as an Academic Discipline," Academic Questions. 16:36-45.

Kors, Alan Charles and Harvey A. Silvergate
1998   The Shadow University: The Betrayal of Liberty on America's
              Campuses. New York: The Free Press.

Ladd, Everett Carl, Jr., and Seymour Martin Lipset
1973   Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. Berkeley, CA:
              Carnegie foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the
              Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Langenberg, Donald N.
1999   "On the Horizon: The Learning System," in Gerald L. Gaither (ed.),
              The Multicampus System: Perspectives on Practice and Projects.
              Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishers, 1999. Pp. 215-30.

Layzell, Daniel T. and Kent Caruthers
1999   "Budget and Budget-related Policy Issues for Multicampus Systems,"
              in Gerald L. Gaither (ed.), The Multicampus System: Perspectives on
              Practice and Projects. Sterline, VA: Stylus Publishers. Pp. 110-27.

Long, Bridget Terry
2010   "Higher-Education Finance and Accountability," in Kevin Carey
              and Mark Schneider (eds.), Accounting in American Higher
              Education. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan. Pp. 141-63.

Lopez, Cecelia L.
2004   "A Decade of Assessing Student Learning: What We Have Learned,
              and What is Next?" in Peter Hernon and Robert E. Dugan (eds.).
              Outcomes Assessment in Higher Education. Westport, CT: Libraries
              Unlimited. Pp. 29-71.

Lucas, Christopher J.
2006   American Higher Education: A History. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Lyell, Katherine
2009   "Market-driven Trends in the Financing of Higher Education: What
              Can We Learn from Each Other?" in John Aubrey Douglass, C. Judson
              King, and Irwin Feller (eds.), Globalization's Muse: Universities and
              Higher Education Systems in a Changing World. Berkeley, CA:
              Berkeley Public Policy Press. Pp. 81-91.

Lyons, Richard E.

        2007   Best Practices for Supporting Adjunct Faculty. Boston, MA: Anker
                      Publishing Company.

Marcus, Jon
        2011   "Old School: Four Hundred Years of Resistance to Change,"
                      in Ben Wildawsky, Andrew P. Kelley and Kevin Carey (eds.),
                      Reinventing Higher Education: The Promise of Innovation.
                      Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Pp. 41-72.

Martin, Lawrence B.
        2010   "Faculty Scholarly Productivity at American Research Universities,"
                      in Kevin Carey and Mark Schneider (eds.), Accountability in American
                      Higher Education. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan. Pp. 33-119.

McCaffery, Peter
        2010   The Higher Education Manager's Handbook: Effective Leadership
                      in Universities and Colleges (second edition). New York: Routledge.

McManis, F. L. and W. D. Parker
        1978   Implementing Management Information Systems in Colleges and Universities.
                      Littleton, CO: Ireland Educational Corporations.

McMillen, William
        2010   From Campus to Capitol: The Role of Government Relation in
                      Education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Meikeljohn, Alexander
        1920   The Liberal College. Boston: Marshall Jones Company.

Moore, Wilbert E. and Melvin M. Tumin
        1949   "Some Social Functions of Ignorance," American Sociological Review.
                      14:787-95.

National Center for Education Statistics
        2003   Table 264, "Full-time and Part-time Faculty Instructional Staff in
                      Degree Granting Institutions, by Race-ethnicity, Sex, and Selected
                      Characteristics. NCES, 2003.

National Institute of Education
        1984   Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher
                      Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Neal, John E.
        1995   "Overview of Policy and Practice: Differences and Similarities in
                      Developing Higher Education Accountability," in Gerald H. Gaither
                      (ed.), Assessing Performance in an Age of Accountability. San
                      Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. Pp. 5-10.

Nelkin, Dorothy, Richard Nelson, and Casey Kiernan
        1987   "Commentary: University-Industry Alliances." Science, Technology,
                      and Human Values. 21(2):65-74.

Nelson, Stephen
        2007   Leaders in the Labyrinth: College Presidents and the Battleground of
                      Creeds and Convictions. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Nisbet, Robert
        1971   The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: the University in America,
                      1945-1970. New York: Basic Books.

Nussbaum, Martha
        2011   "Not for Profit," Oxford Today. 24(1):28-29.

Ogburn, William F. and Meyer F. Nimkoff
        1955   Technology and the Changing Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

O'Neill, Robert M.
        2000   "Academic Freedom in Retrospect and Prospect," in Peggie J.
                      Hollingsworth (ed.), Unfettered Expression: Freedom in American
                      Intellectual Life. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan
                      Press. Pp. 19-30.

Ostriker, Jeremiah P. and Charlott V. Kuh (eds.), assisted by James A. Voytuk
        2003   Assessing Research-Doctorate Programs: A Methodological
                      Study. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Padilla, Arthur
        2004   "Passing the Baton: Leadership Transition and the Tenure of
                      Presidents," in James Martin, James El Samels & Associates,
                      Presidential Transition in Higher Education: Managing Leadership
                      Change. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp.
                      37-58.

Paradeise, Catherine and Jean-Claude Thoenig
        2011   "The Road to World Class University: Elites and Wannabes," paper delivered at a conference,
                      "Bringing Public Organizations Back In," Organizational Studies Workshop at Les Vaux de
                      Cerney, May 25-27.

Parsons, Talcott
        1973   "Epilogue: The University 'Bundle': A Study of the Balance Between
                      Differentiation and Integration," Neil J. Smelser and Gabriel Almond
                      (eds.), Public Higher Education in California. Berkeley, CA: University

of California Press. Pp. 275-99.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and G. R. Slancik
       1974   "Organization Decision Making as a Political Process: The Case of a University Budget." Administrative Science Quarterly. 19:135-51.

Potter, David and Arthur W. Chickering
       1991 "The 21st Century: The Role of Government," in Ronald R. Sims and Serbrenia J. Sims (eds.), Managing Institutions of Higher Education into the 21st Century. New York: Greenwood Press. Pp. 10-30.

Power, MIchael
       1997   The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Readings, Bill
       1996   The University in Ruins. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reisman, David
       1980   On Higher Education: the Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rhoades, Gary
       1996   "Organizing the Faculty Workforce for Flexibility," Journal of Higher Education. 66:629-59.

Rhoades, Gary
       1998   Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Richardson, Richard C. Jr., and Alicia D. Hurley
       2005   "From Low Income and Minority Access to Middle Income Affordability: A Case Study of the US Federal Role in Providing Access to Higher Education," in Ase Gornitzka, Maurice Kogan and Alberto Amaral (eds.), Reform and Change in Higher Education: Analysing Policy Implementation. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Rosenstone, Steven J.
       2005   "Challenges Facing Higher Education in America: Lessons and Opportunities," in Frank Jacobucci and Corolyn Tuohy, Taking Public Education Seriously. Totonto: Toronto University Press. Pp. 55-86.

Rosenzweig, Robert M.
       1998   The Political University: Policy, Politics, and Presidential Leadership in the American Research University. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rosovsky, Henry
       1990   The University: An Owner's Manual. New York: W. W. Norton.

Rossi, Peter H. and Howard E. Freeman
       1992   Evaluation: A Systematic Approach. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Rourke, Francis and Glenn Brooks
       1966   The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ruben, Julie A.
       1996   The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sadovnik, Alan R.
       1993   Equity and Excellence in Higher Education: The Decline of a Liberal Educational Reform. New York: Peter Lang.

Scarlett, Mel
       2004   The Great Ripoff in American Education: Undergrads Underserved. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Schumpeter, Joseph A.
       1934   The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schuster, Jack H. and Martin J. Finkelstein
       2006   The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Scott, Peter
       2001 "Universities as Organizations and Their Governance," in Werner Z. Hirsch and Luc E. Weber (eds.), Governance in Higher Education: The University in a State of Flux. London: Economica. Pp. 125-42.

Seldin, Peter and Associates
       2006   Evaluating Faculty Performance: A Practical Guide to Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service. Boston, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Shavit, Yossi, Richard Arm and Adam Gamoran, with Gila Menahem (eds.)
       2007   Stratification in Higher Education: A Comparative Study. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Shleifer, Andrei and Robert W. Vishny
      2005   "Stock Market Driven Acquisitions." In Corporate Restructuring,
           eds. John J. McConnell and David J. Denis. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, Pp. 81-97.

Simon, Herbert A.
      2001   "Rationality in Society," In International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences,
           eds. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Oxford: Elsevier. Vol. 19, pp. 12782-86.

Slaughter, Sheila
      1991   "The 'Official' Ideology of Higher Education: Ironies and
           Inconsistencies," in William G. Tierney (ed.), Culture and Ideology
           In Higher Education: Advancing a Critical Agenda. New York:
           Praeger. Pp. 59-85.

Slaughter, Sheila and Larry L. Leslie
      1997   Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial
           University. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins, University Press.

Slaughter, Sheila and Gary Rhoades
      2008   The Academic Capitalist Knowledge/Learning Regime," in
           Adrienne S. Chan and Donald Fisher (eds.), The Exchange
           University: The Corporatization of Academic Culture. Vancouver,
           BC:UBC Press. Pp. 19-48.

Smelser, Neil J.
      1974   "Growth, Structural Change, and Conflict in California Public Higher Education, 1950,"
           in Neil J. Smelser and Gabriel Almond (eds.),
           Public Higher Education in California. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Pp. 9-141.

Smelser, Neil J.
      2000   "Foreword," to Clark Kerr, Academic Triumphs. Vol. 1, The Gold and the Blue: A Personal
           Memoir of the University of California, 1949-1967. Berkeley, University of California Press. Pp. xxix-xxvii.

Smelser, Neil J.
      2010   Reflections on the University of California: From the Free Speech
           Movement to the Global University. Berkeley, CA: University of
           California Press.

Smelser, Neil J. and John S. Reed
      2012   Usable Social Science. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Stadtman, Verne A.
      1980   Academic Adaptations: Higher Education Prepares for the 1980s and
           1990s. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Steedle, Jeffrey
      2010   "On the Foundations of Standardized Assessment of College Outcomes
           and Estimating Value Added," in Keven Crey and Mark Schneider
           (eds.) Accounting in American Higher Education. New York: Palgrave-
           Macmillan. Pp. 7-31.

Stokes, Peter
      2011   "What Online Learning Can Teach Us about Higher Education," in Ben
           Wildawsky, Andre P. Kelley, and Kevin Kelly (eds.), Reinventing
           Education: The Promise of Innovation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
           University Press. Pp. 197-224.

Streeter, Thomas
      2004   "Romanticism in Business Culture: The Internet, the 1990s, and the
           Origins of Irrational Exuberance," in Andrew Calabrese and Colin
           Spaks (eds.), Toward a Political Economy of Culture, Capitalism, and
           in the Twenty-First Century. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield
           Publishers. Pp. 286-306.

Swing, Randy L.
      2009   "Higher Education Counts: Data for Decision Support," in Gary L.
           Olson and John W. Presley (eds.), The Future of Higher Education:
           Perspectives from America's Academic Leaders. Boulder, CO:
           Paradigm Press. Pp. 139-47.

Sykes, Charles J.
      1988   Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education.
           Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1988.

Teather, D.
      1990   "Performance Indicators in Australian Higher Education: The Context
           and an Appraisal of the 1988 Report," in F. Dochy, M. Segers and W.
           Wijnen (eds), Management Information and Performance Indicators
           In Higher Education. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum & Co. Pp.
           ??-?? [NB: Alternate source, p. 53 of notes 2] {GO TO ED-PSYCH}

Thelin, John R.
      2004a   A History of American Higher Eduction. Balatimore, MD: The Johns
           Hopkins University Press.

Thelin, John R.
      2004b   "Higher Education and the Public Trough," in Edward P. St. John and
           Michael D. Parsons (eds.), Public Funding of Higher Education:
           Changing Contexts and New Rationales. Baltimore: The Johns

Hopkins University Press. Pp. 28-38.

Toby, Jackson
        2010   The Lowering of Higher Education in America: Why Financial Aid
                    Should be Based on Student Performance. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Touraine, Alain
        1997   The Academic System in American Society (with a new Introduction
        [1974]
                    by Clark Kerr). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Trani, Eugene P. and Robert D. Holsworth
        2010   The Indispensable University: Higher Education, Economic
                    Development, and the Knowledge Economy. Lanham, MD:
                    Roman and Littlefield Publishers.

Trow, Martin
        1990   "The University Presidency: Comparative Reflections on Leadership,"
                    in Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois, Values, Leadership
                    and Quality: The Administration of Higher Education. Urbana, IL:
                    University of Illinois Press. Pp. 95-119.

Trow, Martin
        1997   "The Development of Information Technology in American Higher
                    Education," Daedalus, 126:293-314.

Trow, Martin
        1998   "On the Accountability of Higher Education in the United States,"
                    in William G. Bowen and Harold T. Shapiro, Universities and Their
                    Leadership. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp. 15-61.

Tuchman, Gaye
        2009   Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University. Chicago: University of
                    Chicago Press.

Tussman, Joseph T.
        1997   The Beleaguered College: Essays on Educational Reform. Berkeley,
                    CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press.

U.S. News and World Report
        2011   Ultimate College Guide. Naperville. IL: Sourcebooks Inc.

Veblen, Thorstein
        1968   Higher Learning in America. New York: Hill and Wong.
        [1918]

Vest, Charles M.
        2005   The American Research University from World War II to
                    the World Wide Web: Governments, the Private Sector, and
                    the Rise of the Meta-University. Berkeley, CA: University
                    of California Press.

Veysey, Laurence R.
        1965   The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University
                    of Chicago Press.

Vogel, Ezra F.
        1979   Japan as Number One: Lessons for America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wadsworth, Deborah
        2005   "Ready or Not? Where the Public Stands on Higher Education
                    Reform," in Richard H. Hersch and John Merrow (eds.), Declining by Degrees: Higher Education at Risk.
                    New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Pp. 23-38.

Walsh, Taylor
        2011   Unlocking the Gates: How and Why Leading Universities are Opening
                    Up Access to Their Courses. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Washburn, Jennifer
        2005   University, Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education. New
                    York: Basic Books.

Weigartner, Rudlph H.
        1996   Fitting Form to Function: A Primer on the Organization of Academic
                    Institutions. Phoenix, AZ: The Onyx Press.

White, Geoffrey D., and Flanner C. Hauck
        2000   Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower. Amherst, NY:
                    Prometheus Books.

Wildawksy, Ben
        2010   "How College Rankings are going Global (and Why Their Spread Will
                    Be Good for Higher Education)" in Kevin Carey and Mark Schneider
                    (eds.), Accounting in American Higher Education. New York:
                    Palgrave-Macmillan. Pp. 211-49.

Wilke, Arthur S.
        1979   "Preface," in Arthur S. Wilke (ed.), The Hidden Professoriate: Credentialism, Professionalism, and the Tenure Crisis. Westport, CN:
                    Greenwood Press. Pp. xi-xv.

Wilson, John K.
        2008   Patriotic Correctness: Academic Freedom and its Enemies. Boulder,
                    CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Worthen, Helena and Joe Berry
      1999   Conditional Faculty in Public Higher Education in Pennsylvania,
               Spring, 1999: Focus on the Community Colleges. Harrisburg, PA: Keystone Research Center.
Zdziarski, Eugene L. II, Norbert W. Dunkel, J. Michael Rollo and Associates
      2007   Campus Crisis Management: A Comprehensive Guide to Prevention,
              Response, and Recovery. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Zemsky, Robert, Gregory R. Wegner and William F. Massy
      2005   Remaking the American University: Market-Smart and Mission-
              Centered. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Zima, Peter V.
      2002   Deconstruction and Critical Theory. London: Continuum.
Zumeta, William
      2004   "State Higher Education Financing: Demand Imperatives Meet
              Structural, Cyclical, and Political Constraints," in Edward P. St.
              John and Michael D. Parsons (eds.), Public Funding of Higher
              Education: Changing Contexts and New Rationales. Baltimore, MD:
              The Johns Hopkins University Press. Pp. 79-107.