Higher Education 22: 339–350, 1991.
© 1991 *Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.*

Caught in the middle: faculty and institutional status and quality in state comprehensive universities*

BRUCE B. HENDERSON[1] & WILLIAM D. KANE[2]
[1] *Department of Psychology, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723, U.S.A.*
[2] *School of Business, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC 28723, U.S.A.*

Abstract. Faculty members at state-related comprehensive universities (SCUs) are 'caught in the middle,' caught between the demands of a research university model of higher education and other models such as that of the liberal arts or community colleges. They are caught in the ambiguity of not having determined their own identity. The SCUs are a major force in higher education that resulted from historical trends and the demands of parents, students, and state legislators for services. But the emerging form of these institutions has yet to complete its metamorphosis. During their transformation, the SCUs have emulated the high-status research universities as their own low status forced a search for an identity different from their origins, commonly as teachers colleges. The unfortunate consequence of the SCUs' quest for status has been low faculty satisfaction and additional loss of institutional self-esteem. Furthermore, an emphasis on published research has led to a disparagement of scholarship as it is manifested in teaching and service. As faculty members focus more on disciplinary research, their involvement with students and in university governance and other campus affairs diminishes. What can SCUs do? Five alternative approaches that SCUs could use to develop distinct identities appropriate to their constituencies are examined. The concept that connects these different approaches is 'scholarship,' in its traditional sense. A broader definition of scholarship could enable the SCUs to achieve excellence in ways not dictated by the research university model. There is some reason to hope that there is increasingly effective internal and external pressures for SCUs to develop and enact such distinctive identities.

Rapid growth, an evolving mission, and changes in American higher education have left the comprehensive state colleges and universities caught in the middle. They cannot acquire the reputations of the major research universities. They do not have the resources of the research and doctorate-granting institutions. Neither do they have the traditions or orientation of the liberal arts colleges or specific mission of the community colleges. Their faculties are expected to conduct research, but carry heavy teaching loads and frequently do not have graduate students to assist in research. Their students, on the average, are less well prepared than those at many research or doctorate-granting universities and liberal arts colleges. Thus, the state comprehensive universities are caught between the major research university model on one hand and the liberal arts college model on the other (throughout this paper, we use the Carnegie scheme for categorizing types of institutions: research university, doctorate-granting university, comprehensive university, and liberal arts college). The peculiar circumstances of the comprehensive state colleges and universities led George Weathersby to conclude that: 'For many reasons, these colleges are in transition. Many have already lost their focus and now face the

likelihood of losing their distinctiveness and purposefulness of mission as well (Weathersby 1983, p. 24).

We base this paper on the premise that the drift described by Weathersby has occurred because the research university model has been used by those inside and outside the state comprehensive colleges and universities (hereinafter abbreviated as SCUs) to judge institutional status and quality. We suggest that the outcome is the SCU's emulation of the model, which has, in turn, resulted in the lack of a distinctive mission and the loss of institutional and individual faculty esteem. We then propose a broadening of the concept of scholarship that could help SCUs better focus their efforts. While our argument is based on an analysis of the SCU's situation in the United States, there may be parallels in the development of the polytechnics and colleges of education in the United Kingdom and in the higher education system in Australia (Eurich 1981; Lysons 1990; Trow 1984).

Historical background

The American university is often perceived as a monolithic entity whose purpose is well defined and agreed upon. Historians of higher education know better. Higher education in the U.S. has developed along multiple tracks. The best known and most extensively studied track traces the history of the major research universities (including the land-grants). Much less well documented is the history of the SCUs. Exceptions include Harcleroad and Ostar's (1987) recent sketch and Dunham's (1969) *The Colleges of the Forgotten Americans*, which might well have been called 'Forgotten Colleges of America.'

For the most part, the early development of the research universities had little impact on undergraduate education institutions (Jencks and Riesman 1968). However, following World War II, as the demand for higher education increased dramatically, universities instituted more selective admissions procedures. This led to pressures on institutions that had traditionally prepared public school teachers to admit students into a much wider range of programs. In the process, they formed a unique type of higher education institution, the comprehensive state college and university (see Harcleroad and Ostar 1987, for a detailed history of the SCUs). During the same period, the research universities were producing an increasing number of persons with PhDs who took positions in the former teachers colleges. Thus, the once independent tracks of different forms of higher education crossed. One result was that by 1985, no public college included 'teachers college' in its name, a fact that no one in 1948 or even 1961 would have predicted (Harcleroad and Ostar 1987).

The mid-20th century, demand-driven growth of the SCUs was paralleled by a number of important trends in higher education. These included the push by accreditation agencies for doctoral-level faculties and the decline in availability of faculty positions in the research universities for their own graduating doctoral students. The surplus of research-trained graduates found that the SCUs welcomed them with some ambivalence. Dunham described some of the major conflicts that occurred as the former teachers colleges broadened their programs:

> The new breed faculty call for higher standards in undergraduate admissions and are tougher in their grading. This new breed is far more concerned with inducting new professionals into the academic guild than preparing warm and dedicated teachers for the public schools. General education courses are increasingly difficult to staff; faculty want to teach only upper-division and graduate courses. The new faculty show more concern for knowledge about their disciplines and colleagues within that discipline at other institutions than about their own institutions and colleagues in other departments on their own campus (Dunham 1969, p. 48).

This brief historical sketch shows that the SCUs have become more like the research universities despite their apparently different missions. They are no longer teachers colleges, but the SCUs have not developed alternative distinctive missions and standards of quality. Instead, they have adopted their identities from the higher-status universities.

The problem of status and emulation

If our premise that the SCUs have become more like the research universities is valid, the question remains, why have they done so? The main reason is that the research university provides a powerful model, one that has acquired considerable status in the world of higher education and in the society at large. There are several sources of the power of the model. Perhaps the most basic is that the institutions that propagate the model, whether they are private universities, land-grant schools or 'flagships,' are large, rich and powerful. Furthermore, except for the tradition of small undergraduate liberal arts colleges, there has been no alternative, well-delineated model to emulate. The research universities have no motivation to provide other models given that what has been called the 'Matthew effect,' prosaically summarized as 'them that has, gets,' has worked so well for them (Merton 1968).

Two other aspects of the power of the research model are important for their ultimate influence on the SCUs. First is that the model leads to a dual value system in the faculty. As Alpert (1985) has pointed out, individual faculty members hold the values of their institution and those of their discipline. He argues that, over time and across types of institutions, faculty members have become dependent on disciplinary values for standards of excellence in terms of publication, accreditation, and professional identity. As faculty members become more involved in their disciplines, they are released from the chores of teaching or committee service on their own campus to spend more time away from campus. Research productivity (i.e., publication rates) typically is associated with orientations toward off-campus, disciplinary activities which carry greater status than more local orientations (Fox 1985).

A second aspect of the power of the research model is the monopoly held by the research universities in the preparation of faculty members for all four-year schools. Most faculty members receive their advanced study at the research universities where the graduate school, not undergraduate education, drives the quest for prestige, wealth and power (Bowen and Schuster 1986; Ruscio 1987). It is not

surprising, then, that faculty members trained in such a context would hold strong disciplinary values and desire the perquisites of their training site (e.g., low teaching loads and lack of emphasis on teaching, availability of ample time and resources for research). For the same reason, they may also want 'better' students, ones who have high entering ability and require less time or effort to teach. According to a recent report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1989), over two-thirds of the faculty at SCUs (compared to 55% at research universities) think that the admissions standards at their institution should be higher (Table 22).

What is wrong with the SCUs emulating a powerful, existing model that has established acceptance in the public sector? The problem is that using the research model criteria, the SCUs cannot compete. In the literature on higher education (and in much of the popular press), when the SCUs are discussed they are often alluded to by terms such as the 'weaker universities,' 'less prestigious universities,' 'non-university sector,' 'poor-boy schools,' or 'unproductive universities.' Is this because the SCUs have been evaluated in terms of a distinctive mission or because they are found wanting in terms of the research university standard? The latter is clearly the case.

Universities traditionally have been judged with one or both of two means. One means has been research productivity (Fox 1985; Lyonton 1983), as indicated by publication counts, grant fund totals, or reputational indices (indicative of the ability of an institution's faculty members to communicate their disciplinary expertise to members of the larger academic community). The second type of 'quality' indicator commonly used in ranking institutions is the entering ability of students as reflected in 'average' SAT or ACT scores. The assumption behind this indicator seems to be that there is some linear relationship between the quality of the student upon entrance and the quality of what goes on within the institution. Schools use this indicator in marketing efforts, the public generally accepts them as an indicator of quality, and faculty members frequently use it to judge how 'teachable' their students are.

The important point about status and emulation is that however the SCUs are judged in comparison to the research model, they come up short. SCUs do not appear on lists of 'productive' universities in terms of published research, reputation, or grant funds obtained. An important part of the mission of most SCUs is to serve a broad range of students, not just those with high entering ability. In the next sections, we argue that this state of affairs has led to some unfortunate consequences for the SCUs, including threats to institutional and faculty self-esteem, ambivalence about the roles of teaching and service, and a failure to develop missions distinct from those of the research universities.

Threats to institutional and faculty esteem

How successfully can SCUs and their faculty members emulate the research model? As William James (1890) pointed out many years ago, a discrepancy between pretensions and success can lead to low self-esteem. Do the SCUs have the resources

to be like the research universities? Is there an inevitable discrepancy? Or should there be different indicators of success for the SCUs?

The major indicator of success at the research universities is research productivity, as indicated by publication rates and grant funds received. Although the drift of the SCUs toward the research model has resulted in more emphasis on these activities, no SCUs appear at the top of lists of highly productive institutions, in terms of grants or publications. Yet, as Lynton has argued, across types of universities, '...there is but one accepted, valued and rewarded scholarly goal: To conduct original research and publish it in scholarly, refereed journals' (Lynton 1983, p. 21). This is the case, despite the fact that only a minority of faculty members, even at 'high quality' schools report being heavily involved in research activities (e.g., Bowen and Schuster 1986; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1989; Ladd and Lipset 1975; Trow 1984). The 'ideal' expectation at the SCUs, as well as at the research universities, is rarely met.

One possible outcome of the inconsistency between interests and expectations is low morale. In fact, in their study of faculty members at a variety of different types of institutions, Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978) reported satisfaction to be lowest among faculty members at comprehensive universities relative to other four-year institutions. Bowen and Schuster (1986) also found faculty morale to be 'poor' or 'very poor' at 7 of the 10 comprehensive schools they studied (compared to 1 of 9 research universities and 1 of 7 liberal arts colleges) and to be deteriorating at 5 of the 10. A more recent study indicates that 'Among full-time regular faculty, those at public comprehensive institutions stood out as least likely to be satisfied...' (Russell *et al.* 1990, p. 55). This group had lower than average responses on 15 of the 29 satisfaction items with no items being reported as above average. Compared to other types of institutions, faculty at public comprehensive universities report being less satisfied with: support for teaching and research, what courses they teach, the reputation of their institution, their institution's mission or philosophy, departmental and institutional cooperation, the quality of their colleagues, their undergraduates, the faculty leadership, the mix of their responsibilities, and their workload.

Many factors contribute to this low morale, but one is the increasing emulation of the research model in faculty evaluation. When faculty members are not able, or choose not, to excel in disciplinary research, they will not be rewarded if other activities such as teaching and service are not valued. They may then lapse into self-serving or counterproductive behaviors in regard to their other roles and their institutional commitments (Bess 1982). Faculty development that can meet the diverse needs of individuals and the institution may become difficult or impossible as faculty members suffer loss of self-esteem.

Emulation of the research universities can also lead to collective loss of esteem at the institutional level. A SCU with aspirations to emulate the research universities may find itself falling short because of a lack of support from external sources such as systems-level governing boards or legislatures or from a dissident faculty. As a result, the university may be diverted from efforts that have a higher likelihood of success:

The use of a single measure of institutional excellence assures that lesser institutions refusing to accept mediocrity as a permanent station in life will fight to enlarge the disciplinary research commitment of their faculty and thus to increase the size of each of the disciplinary research communities. This tendency exacerbates competition for limited research funds and offers little incentive to embark in new areas of basic or applied research or to develop new approaches to instruction (Alpert 1985, p. 270).

Implications for the quality of teaching and service

Perhaps the most pervasive implication of the use of the research model for assessing the quality of higher education is the failure to attend to, or to denigrate, the other 'legs of the stool,' teaching and service. A commonly held position is that there is a correlation between the quality (or quantity) of research and teaching and service. Those who produce the most publishable research are thought to be the best teachers and service providers. However, at least in regard to the relation between teaching and research, empirical studies strongly suggest that the activities are independent (see Feldman 1987, for an exhaustive review). Thus, the presence of high-quality research does not guarantee that the other activities of an institution will be of high quality.

The independence of teaching and research quality indicates that an emphasis on research need not interfere with the quality of a faculty member's other activities. However, there are several potential threats to overall institutional quality from the application of the research standard. First is the threat of narrowness. In this era of specialization, a teacher at a SCU who teaches to an undergraduate or masters-level audience only what he or she is researching would have very short courses indeed. Second, use of the research model may lead to an overemphasis on research and publication in hiring and evaluation processes. The relatively easy quantification of publication makes its use tempting. More important, the overreliance on publishable research in evaluations has allowed institutions and faculty to avoid engaging in finding ways to critically evaluate the quality of teaching, research or service. It can also inhibit faculty members' motivation to develop more effective or innovative approaches in all three areas.

A final, more subtle, threat to overall quality results from an overemphasis by faculty members on disciplinary activities at the expense of identification with their local campuses (Alpert 1985). The outcome can be a lack of on-campus involvement and commitment and a pervasive decline in collegiality. Those who are heavily involved in research may not take the responsibility for campus governance while those who have not been rewarded due to perceived low productivity may have withdrawn whatever commitment they had. As the collegial structure deteriorates, the resulting vacuum may well be filled by bureaucratic administration as faculty members pursue individual interests (for examples, see Austin and Gamson 1984).

Distinctive missions for the SCUs

The emulation of and drift toward the research university model, the loss of individual and institutional esteem, and the lack of attention to overall quality can be linked to a related set of problems. They include the failure of the SCUs to: (a) carve out a mission and identity distinct from that of the research universities; (b) implement a distinctive course of action; and (c) develop methods to evaluate individual and institutional quality in ways that are consistent with that mission and identity. Trow (1984) has formulated the problem well in connecting it to the downward mobility of professors in the 'nonelite sectors':

> The fact that so many teachers in the new nonuniversity sectors were trained in the universities explains the tendency of those institutions to 'drift' toward the forms and functions of the universities and especially of research; it also helps explain the widespread disappointment, dissatisfaction, and alienation experienced by so many teachers in the nonuniversity sector. The real issue is whether the nonuniversity sector is able to create for itself a distinctive identity and mission, separate from that of the universities and acceptable to its staff as an alternative to a position in the university. (Trow 1984, footnote, pp. 156–157).

The dilemma of the SCUs is not unique. All institutions, if they are to survive hard times, must develop an effective purpose. The particular problem of the SCUs is how to battle the hegemony of a powerful, pre-existing model. The research model is used implicitly and uncritically by the SCUs' internal and external constituencies, essentially by default. The SCUs fear the loss of prestige in being known simply as 'teaching' colleges (somehow not different enough from the abandoned 'teachers' college). However, the SCUs can no more consider themselves 'teaching colleges' than they can take on the 'research university' label. To do so would be to describe inaccurately what they do. Most SCUs provide a broad range of regional and statewide services and many of their faculty members conduct research that serves disciplinary and instructional purposes. SCUs truly exist in a middle ground between research universities and institutions whose only or major missions are instructional.

A number of alternatives to the research model have been offered that could help the SCUs distinguish themselves from the research universities, doctorate-granting universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges. They include: (a) an explicit division of labor by type of institution, an assignment of distinctive missions, perhaps imposed by the higher-level state governing boards or system-level central administration (Weathersby 1983). This division is already represented de facto in different funding formulas, allocation of resources, and approval of degree programs. But it is often resisted by faculty members and administrators at SCUs as the conferring of second-class citizenship; (b) the development of alternative measures of excellence that explicitly recognize both disciplinary standards and the responsibilities of campus community membership (Alpert 1985); (c) the development of alternative means of preparing faculty members for the SCUs that emphasize teaching and deemphasize research. The Doctor of Arts has been suggested as an appropriate degree for such preparation (Harcleroad and Ostar

1987); and (d) efforts to legitimize new ways to disseminate information that could break the grip of refereed publication (Lynton 1983). In a 1989 report (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1989), 68% of responding faculty members across institutional types, including 79% of the respondents from comprehensive universities, reported a need for better ways to evaluate scholarly performance.

Each of these alternatives would provide more recognition for teacher to teacher, teacher to student, and teacher to public means of disseminating knowledge and would allow such efforts to receive credit in reward systems. A deemphasis of a unitary model of increasingly bureaucratic and narrow research need not lead to a loss of faculty vitality. There is plenty to do in teaching and in organizing and summarizing knowledge. And, 'when opportunity permits or spontaneous curiosity dictates, then one may add his small bit of fact that is needed and that fits onto what we know, or yet again one may worthily keep the public informed of these advances, thus preventing the existence of an unbridgeable gap between learned and laity' (Barzun 1960, p. 74).

Going beyond these limited alternatives requires a more fundamental change in how we think about higher education. Astin (1985) has proposed a 'talent development' model as an alternative to the research/reputational and resource models for evaluating the quality of higher education institutions. He argues that an institution should be evaluated on the basis of its ability to help students and faculty to reach their potential. Astin's model allows the attainment of excellence to be a goal for a wide variety of institutions. Institutions could ignore competitive rankings and would not need to limit student access in order to maintain attractive average entrance test scores. On the faculty side, it allows for multiple definitions of talent that include valuing pedagogical and service as well as research activities.

Astin's model makes sense for most SCUs and, in fact, is consistent with many SCU's self-descriptions (e.g., AASCU 1971). However, it runs counter to the prevailing value system of American higher education in a fundamental way. The tradition has been to evaluate academic products (e.g., SAT scores, publications, FTE students, number of faculty with doctorates), not processes. As Astin has recognized: '...academicians value *demonstration* of intellect over the *development* of intellect' (Astin 1989, p. 131). However, his model does not clearly indicate against what criteria student and faculty 'talent' are to be judged. After intellect has been developed, there must be some means for its demonstration. In the final section of this paper, we will explore an alternative focus for the building of distinctive roles and missions by SCUs that holds on to the most central and positive aspects of the research model without requiring hopeless emulation of it.

Recapturing the central concept of scholarship

It is no coincidence that colleges and universities of very different kinds include teaching, research, and service as parts of their mission statements. All three involve learning: the acquisition, dissemination, and use of knowledge. These are the

activities of scholars. The fundamental basis of what goes on, or should be going on, in colleges and universities is scholarship. Unfortunately, in most academic circles, the term 'scholarship' has been appropriated as a label for only one type of scholarly activity, the production of publishable research. In contrast, the first definition of scholarship in the *Oxford Dictionary* is 'the attainments of a scholar; learning, erudition' and erudition is defined as 'the action or process of training or instructing; instruction, education.' This shift in word use would not be so problematic if an alternative term were available, but it is not. Our concept of scholarship in higher education needs to be broadened in a way that is consistent with its dictionary definition (Boyer 1987).

Although the narrow use of scholarship is pervasive, it has not lost its original meaning in all contexts. For example, Ruscio (1987) found that faculty members at selective liberal arts colleges see scholarship as investment in students and are likely to move across disciplinary and subdisciplinary categories in their teaching and research. Similarly, Pellino, Blackburn, and Boberg (1984) found that the conceptions of scholarship held by faculty members and administrators in a variety of institutions included six different categories of scholarly activity. They included scholarship as: (a) professional activity (e.g., editorial and grant reviewing); (b) research and publication; (c) artistic expression; (d) engagement with the novel (e.g., innovations in teaching, involvement with student projects); (e) community service (e.g., off-campus speaking engagements and consulting); and (f) pedagogy (course development, acquiring new information for teaching, conducting library research, systematizing one's own work, curriculum revision). Scholarship as research and publication was rated highest in importance in research universities, but scholarship as pedagogy was ranked highest in all other types of institutions. Administrators, especially those at comprehensive regional universities, gave higher importance ratings than did faculty members to scholarship as research and publication.

In describing a forthcoming report from the Carnegie Foundation, Rice (1990) presented an explicit model for a broader definition of scholarship. This enlarged view is designed to more accurately reflect the actual practice of scholars reported by Pellino *et al.* (1984). The framework of the model includes four major categories of scholarship. One, the *advancement of knowledge*, represents the traditional form of original disciplinary research. The second category, the *integration of knowledge*, focuses on the synthesis of information in theories within and across disciplines and across time. The *application of knowledge*, the third category, occurs in professional education and professional services of all kinds. The final category, *scholarship for teaching*, has three distinct elements which are also embedded in other categories. One element is 'synoptic capacity,' the integration of knowledge in a context that is meaningful to students. Second, 'pedagogical content knowledge,' has to do with the knowledge structures used in the paradigms of particular disciplines. Third is 'what we know about learning,' the element of scholarship that pertains to the teacher's understanding of how students best learn.

The argument described by Rice is that a broader concept of scholarship would enhance faculty vitality by allowing individuals to follow their interests, do what they do best, professionally develop in ways other than disciplinary specialization,

and provide a more diverse set of resources for higher education. At the institutional level, different types of colleges and universities could achieve excellence on their own terms, providing a better fit between faculty efforts and institutional missions.

Clearly, the use of research productivity as the single measure of individual and institutional quality is in conflict with the multidimensional nature of scholarship as it is practiced. What would be the advantages of using this broader notion of scholarship as a model for assessing quality in the SCUs? First, a division of labor among universities could be made explicit without necessarily creating a status hierarchy based on research-determined prestige. SCUs could attain excellence by demonstrating a high level of scholarship in teaching and service as well as in research.

Second, taking the concept of scholarship seriously means finding ways to critically evaluate the level of scholarship in teaching, service, and research. The need for new measures of quality is not peculiar to the SCUs, but is particularly important to them if they are to find ways to be distinctive by intent rather than by default. For example, the search for new ways to evaluate the scholarly quality of the teaching enterprise at the SCUs will have to focus on both the faculty members' disciplinary scholarship (in terms of comprehensiveness, accuracy and recency) and their pedagogical scholarship.

Third, an emphasis on scholarship legitimizes involvement with students as an alternative means of dissemination of knowledge. The potential exists to build a reward system that can discriminate between the pedagogically ineffective, out-of-date professor who manages to publish an arcane piece of trivia and the non-publishing professor who is a true model of scholarship, one who is a teacher-scholar in practice.

Finally, a stress on multiple expressions of scholarship can begin to break the grip on the academic freedom of scholars held by the disciplines' journals and grant reviewing and accreditation processes. Innovation and interdisciplinary efforts in teaching and research could be encouraged rather than disparaged. Furthermore, attempts to more closely integrate teaching and research, and service and research, could be encouraged and rewarded. As Carole Aldrich recently wrote in a letter to the editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education:*

> A value system in which professors first valued scholarship, second the community of scholars in which they lived their daily lives, and third their chosen area of search for knowledge would support real hope for improved learning environments for our students, improved administrative climate and governance at our institutions, and even for more honest and well-researched disciplinary development (1989 p. B5).

Prospects for developing distinctive missions

What is the likelihood that the SCUs will adopt some form of the scholarship model and develop truly distinctive missions? Can they find meaningful ways to be different from the research universities and liberal arts and community colleges at a

high level of quality? There is some cause for hope. Over 70% of faculty members at all colleges and universities perceive themselves as teacher-scholars (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1989). Scholars have long been dissatisfied with the focus on quantity rather than quality in evaluating research activity. In addition, recent national reports have called for a renewed emphasis on teaching and the Carnegie Foundation's prestige should aid the attempts to broaden the concept of scholarship.

However, two enormous tasks have to be accomplished if SCUs are going to find a new path, one of their own making. First, the climate created by the prevailing status sytem must be altered. The attitudes of faculty members and administrators must shift so that types of scholarship, other than the advancement of knowledge, are truly valued and rewarded at the highest levels of the tenure, promotion and compensation processes. The key actors who will have to provide the leadership needed to accomplish this shift are senior administrators and faculty members who are willing to band together to bring about change. Administrators have the status of office and the pulpit that can bring about clear direction for individual institutions. Faculty members, acting as change agents, have the legitimacy to alter the values and attitudes of their peers. Second, the reward systems of higher education, the tenure, promotion and compensation processes, must be broadened in such ways that all forms of scholarship are evaluated and rewarded at the highest possible levels. Important here will be faculty members and middle-level administrators who are willing to find ways to carefully and creatively evaluate the full variety of expressions of scholarship. Ways must be found to discern what is scholarly in teaching, service, and research.

It will take an unusual exercise of leadership and fortitude to make significant changes. What George Weathersby wrote in 1983 remains true:

> American state colleges are not yet an endangered species. The question is not whether they will continue to exist but whether they will exist with any vitality, with a clearly focused mission, and whether their contribution will be commensurate with its cost to the public. There is every reason to believe that they will meet these challenges, but there are also many circumstances demonstrating that the perpetuation of the status quo will not serve those future purposes well (1983, p. 33).

Note

* We would like to thank those many reviewers, anonymous and known, who graciously gave their time to read and comment on earlier, longer forms of this paper.

References

Aldrich, C. A. (1989). 'Faculty members' values need reordering', (Letter to the editor) *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 35 (17), B5.

Alpert, D. (1985). 'Performance and paralysis: the organizational context of the American research university', *Journal of Higher Education* 56, 241–281.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (1971). *Quality and Effectiveness in Undergraduate Higher Education.* Washington: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving Educational Excellence.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1989). 'Moral messages of the university', *Educational Record* 70, 22–25.

Austin, A. E. and Gamson, Z. F. (1984). *Academic Workplace: New Demands, Heightened Tensions.* Washington: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Baldridge, J. W., Curtis, D., Ecker, G. and Riley, G. (1978). *Policy Making and Effective Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barzun, J. (1960). 'The cults of "research" and "creativity"', *Harper's Magazine* 222 (October), 69–74.

Bess, J. L. (1982). *University Organization: A Matrix Analysis of the Academic Professions.* New York: Human Sciences Press.

Bowen, H. R. and Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America.* New York: Harper and Row.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). *The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Dunham, E. A. (1969). *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Eurich, N. P. (1981). *Systems of Higher Education in Twelve Countries: A Comparative View.* New York: Praeger.

Feldman, K. A. (1987). 'Research productivity and scholarly accomplishment of college teachers as related to their instructional effectiveness: a review and exploration', *Research in Higher Education* 26, 227–298.

Fox, M. F. (1985). 'Publication, performance, and reward in science and scholarship', in Smart, J. C. (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (Vol. 1). New York: Agathon Press, pp. 255–282.

Harcleroad, F. F. and Ostar, A. W. (1987). *Colleges and Universities for Change: America's Comprehensive Public State Colleges and Universities.* Washington: AASCU Press.

James, W. (1890). *The Principles of Psychology.* New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1968). *The Academic Revolution.* New York: Doubleday and Company.

Ladd, L. S. and Lipset, S. M. (1975). *The Divided Academy: Professors and Politics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lynton, E. A. (1983). 'A crisis of purpose: reexamining the role of the university', *Change* 15, 18–23, 53.

Lysons, A. (1990). 'Dimensions and domains of organisational effectiveness in Australian higher education', *Higher Education* 20, 287–300.

Merton, R. K. (1968). 'The Matthew effect in science', *Science* 159, 56–63.

Pellino, G. R., Blackburn, R. T. and Boberg, A. L. (1984). 'The dimensions of academic scholarship: faculty and administrator views', *Research in Higher Education* 20, 103–115.

Rice, R. E. (1990). 'Rethinking what it means to be a scholar', *Teaching Excellence* (Newsletter of the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education).

Ruscio, K. P. (1987). 'The distinctive scholarship of the selective liberal arts college', *Journal of Higher Education* 58, 205–222.

Russell, S. H., Cox, R. S., Williamson, C., Boismier, J., Javitz, H., Fairweather, J. and Zimbler, L. J. (1990). *Faculty in Higher Education Institutions, 1988.* Washington: U.S. Department of Education, Office in Educational Research and Improvement.

Trow, M. A. (1984). 'The analysis of status', in Clark, B. R. (ed.), *Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views.* Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 132–164.

Weathersby, G. B. (1983). 'State colleges in transition', in Froomkin, J. (ed.), *The Crisis in Higher Education.* New York: Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science, pp. 23–33.