

SUSAN FROST, REBECCA CHOPP AND AIMEE L. POZORSKI

ADVANCING UNIVERSITIES: THE GLOBAL CITY AS GUIDE
FOR CHANGE

ABSTRACT. The paper considers the past development of the research university in the United States and argues that one way to guide future change is to embrace a new cultural model. Using Emory University as a case study, along with the more general perspectives offered through a close study of eleven other private US universities and data assimilated from members of the Association of American Universities (AAU), we propose that the development of universities resembles the evolution of some cities from village, to metropolis, to global city. The global city model, characterised by flexible systems and an open culture, could benefit many universities. In describing the next phases of change, our essay discusses these characteristics as they have emerged in some of today's evolving universities.

The most striking thing about the American university in its formative period is the diversity of mind shown by men who spurred its development. Here lies the excitement of their story.
– Laurence R. Veysey 1965

On June 14, 2002, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* ran an article entitled “For Colleges, This Is Not Just Another Recession”, an essay that addresses the current financial and structural crises of American universities. Long-time observer of higher education David Breneman begins by questioning our own capacities – we who pride ourselves on a commitment to learning – to learn from the history of past economic recessions and to use that learning to improve universities. Breneman suggests that it is time to recognise the “structural difficulties” hampering university growth and to attempt to change those structures so that today's recession does not end up disabling universities tomorrow.

Breneman's message is clear: universities must evolve in the manner all other American institutions have evolved in order to meet new challenges as they occur. And while Breneman underscores how universities are experiencing a more acute crisis than ever before, his focus on necessary structural, or organisational, changes neglects the more profound difficulties at the heart of this issue: the underlying crisis of culture – a crisis of values inherent to, and practices imposed upon, the university – that is bringing the structural crisis to a head.

Today, the forces of change across all parts of society are profound and rapid, challenging the basic values and services of the university. Perhaps



Tertiary Education and Management **10**: 73–86, 2004.
© 2004 Kluwer Academic Publishers. Printed in the Netherlands.

because they are busy responding to urgent demands the challenges bring, many academic leaders have failed to recognise some more important cultural needs. For example, commercial and entrepreneurial forces are putting their stamp on the academy, as is the high cost of research. As leaders fall behind in responding to these new pressures, they may become more adept at putting out fires rather than shaping a new *cultural* vision for their university's future.

Breneman makes clear the importance of the university's impending evolution – both structural and – we would add – cultural. However what is not clear is exactly how university leaders might respond to these challenges. In fact, it often seems as if a leader's commitment to structures prohibits any change from happening. Today, what is being called a growth *crisis* might be reformulated as growth *potential*. Perhaps the conflicts and contradictions that we see emerging are being mis-recognised as negative obstacles rather than as what they are: cultural opportunities revealing merely some pangs of expansion.

We thus offer this essay as an opportunity to think about the past and future development of the research university in the US and about ways to guide that change by embracing a new cultural model. Although today's universities may not appear very different from the forms Frederick Rudolph and Laurence Veysey described in the 60s, profound changes have transpired in the ways universities are managed, relate to each other, and explain themselves to the world. How have these changes occurred, and how might they continue in the future? More pressing, perhaps, are questions about guiding this change. What are the roles of leaders who seek the best benefits for the university as a whole?

Throughout this essay, we combine our own research regarding the cultures and structures of some of the leading US universities with the insights of leading scholars in the fields of history, sociology, and higher education. Since we have had the opportunity to work and think at Emory University for many years, much of our discussion will turn to our studies of that university. For more general perspectives, however, we also draw on close study of eleven other private US universities, as well as data assimilated from members of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

The work of several scholars are equally important. Building on Thomas Bender's detailed account of the close relationship between the university and the city, and Saskia Sassen's theorisation of the emerging global city, we suggest that the development of universities resembles the evolution of some cities from village to metropolis to global city.¹ We believe that the global-city model, characterised by flexible systems and

an open culture, could benefit many universities. In describing the next phases of change, our essay discusses these characteristics as they have emerged in some of today's evolving universities. In so doing, we hope to follow others who have helped explain educational organisations and how they change.

For example, in 1963 University of California President Clark Kerr used the term "multiversity" to portray the new scope and complexity of the large research institutions he saw emerging in America. A few years later, organisational theorist Karl Weick suggested that the elements of an educational organisation are not linked in dense, tight ways, but coupled loosely to allow each part to maintain its identity (1976). Describing colleges as "organised anarchies," Michael Cohen and James March named four ambiguities with which college presidents must deal (1983). At about the same time, Burton Clark (1983) articulated four distinct cultures of the academy, explaining that faculty draw their authority from each of those. We follow these thinkers and lean on Bender and Sassen, bringing together their ideas to suggest that understanding a new form of the city might help reveal useful perspectives about how universities are changing.

Although Bender praises attempts to understand the relationship between the university and the city, he maintains that a more nuanced picture of this relationship needs to be developed. We heed Bender's caution, but also find explanatory power in relating the university to the concept of the global city, an ever-changing arena adapting to meet the demands of this century. Just as some cities may not develop characteristics of the global city, some universities may remain more like the metropolis. We also expect that the new concept can apply to other forms of higher education, including some US community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and institutions in other countries as well. Although this study concerns American research universities, global city characteristics may come to define an array of complex yet flexible forms of higher education.

A TALE OF THREE CITIES

In his history of the American college and university, Frederick Rudolph asks: "How and why and with what consequences have the American colleges and universities developed as they have?" (Rudolph 1962, p. viii), and he proceeds to describe that development from aristocratic, colonial colleges, to state and land-grant universities, to the democratic institutions they are today – committed to the growth of knowledge and expansion of educational opportunity. In the beginning, Rudolph explains, "higher

education in America would be governed less by accident than by certain purpose, less by impulse than by design" (p. 3). It is not until later, he argues, that higher education drifted and reluctantly accommodated outside forces, only to recognise belatedly that "while no one was looking, change had, in fact, taken place" (p. 491).

Equally interested in the rise of the research university, Laurence Veysey's 1965 *The Emergence of the American University* argues that conflict drove the university's emergence – a conflict regarding "the basic purpose of the new university and . . . the kind and degree of control to be exerted by the institution's leadership" (Veysey 1965, p. viii). Perhaps due to his interest in conflict, Veysey also explores the relationship between American society and the university – a surprising connection, Veysey tells us, because "ever since the late nineteenth-century the better university campuses have maintained the character of oases, sharply set off from the surrounding society in many of their fundamental qualities" (p. x). It is precisely this relation between the university and the forces that appear external to it (now not only American society but a global culture) that needs to be rethought in the model of the global city.

Just as Veysey traced the connection between society and the US university, Thomas Bender linked the university and the city. Bender, a historian at New York University, is interested particularly in the parallel histories of the city and the university. While hesitating to create identical relationship between the two social systems, Bender notes that: "both are incompletely bounded fields of contention, comprising various traditions, interests, and ideals" (Bender 1998, pp. 290–291). Because of these often divergent or incompatible forces at play, educational institutions – like cities – depend on open structures to advance their own particular identity in the world.

Saskia Sassen's work, in part, responds to Bender's call for more careful meditations on what is meant by such terms as "city" in the phrase "the university and the city." As a sociologist at the University of Chicago who specialises in governance and accountability in a global economy, Sassen may be articulating what is emerging in higher education as well. For Sassen, fluid structures characterise global cities. These structures allow for the institution's culture to produce its identity, rather than having the identity imposed by fixed structures. According to Sassen, as soon as you are in a position to describe the dynamic change in the city, it is already something new. There is thus a persistent challenge to steer and humanise this driving change (Sassen 1991, 2000).

The same could be said about the evolution of the university. First we have the university as *village*, which refers to a civic organisation run more

by general consensus than strict design. Second we have the university as *metropolis*, which is highly differentiated and compartmentalised in space, function and identity. Third we have the university as *global city*, a newly emergent type of organisation that requires open systems. This characteristic of openness helps new ideas emerge out of a culture that is supported, not defined, by its enabling structures. This essay is part of our larger exploration of these ideas. For now, we can outline a possible way of relating the three models of the city to the history and continuing development of the university.

Using the metaphor of the city, the early university was like the village: an organic, civic organisation based on general consensus values and cultural images, where educated citizens held civic debates in public venues. In other words, villages – like early colleges and universities – were not organised according to a given system, but rather in response to concerns communicated freely. Similarly in villages, leaders met needs as they emerged. Needs, not a predetermined system of governance, set the agenda for action.

In contrast, leaders of the metropolis must manage large numbers of busy, mobile and productive citizens. These leaders invented systems to cope with the volume, and soon new bureaucracies were firmly in place. In the early metropolis, systems or bureaucracies begin as helpful, enabling devices and some have stayed that way. Others, however, exhibit closed patterns that have caused them to become controlling or coercive. We see these patterns in the evolution of governments, in the professions of medicine and business, and in the complex family we experience today. When control becomes more burdensome than it is worth, the form might change, ideally evolving into a newer, enabling stage. For, over the course of use, any bureaucracy can become more trouble than the problems it was designed to solve (Adler & Borys 1996; Ramsden 1996).

Perhaps the university as metropolis began to develop in the US around 1900 when departments led to professionalised faculty and formal graduate schools, and the industrial revolution created the wealth that led to professional research. Of course, the systems that supported these activities did not spring from whole cloth. Before 1900–1920, universities in the village stage invented the systems they needed to thrive: the curriculum, majors and electives. By 1930, these evolving forms had lost their random nature and the university began resembling more and more the metropolis. With the founding of the National Science Foundation (NSF) in 1950, the university as metropolis matured. There was much to manage in this new kind of university – from flush funds for research to a more diverse study population.

The negative connotations we associate the words “metropolis” or “bureaucracy” may come from our experience with the impositions they require. Those impositions lead us to ask: What is organisation? Is it a way to deal with complexity by structuring the chaos, or do the requirements that drive the metropolis add to the chaos we resist?

Partly in response to some suffocating aspects of the bureaucratic metropolis, a more open model for the city and, we argue, for the university, is developing: a model dependent upon networks, blurred boundaries, strategic projects and constructed identities. Sassen calls this form the “global city” and names Los Angeles, Tokyo and New York as examples. Emerging through a combination of ideas, identities, economics, material structures and new patterns of immigration, global cities are not a more complex form of the bureaucratic metropolis but a different structure, identity and frame for evolution. Sassen uses the phrase “strategic site” to speak of global cities (Sassen 1998, p. xxi); this may well be an apt metaphor for new forms of university life.

Some universities seem to be shifting in ways comparable to Sassen’s urban descriptions. In the literature on higher education as well as in many universities, we can observe the same metaphors of permeable boundaries, partnerships, strategic sites, contextual and multi-disciplinary identities and intensification of resources in these sites. Universities, once considered “ivory towers,” now seek partners endlessly: with one another, with neighborhoods, with science parks and bio-tech incubators, with international cities and with non-profit and community-based organisations. New institutional structures are emerging, and these structures, along with changing intellectual assumptions, may challenge us to imagine the public as an engaging space for scholarship.

Sassen identifies two aspects in the global city that may help explain this new university form. The first aspect concerns the structure and culture of the city. In the metropolis, structures are fixed, and cultures and traditions are retained or lost based on their fit with the structure. In other words, structure *produces* the essence of the city, and culture *represents* that essence. The reverse is true in the global city. In this new model, culture does not represent but *produces* the essence of the city. Culture and traditions are fixed while structures change to accommodate them.

The second aspect concerns the identity of the city. If culture *represents* the essence of the metropolis, then culture *represents* its identity. If culture *produces* the essence of the global city, then culture *produces* its identity. In the global city, identity, the way people understand the city, reflects change and evolution more quickly. We argue that these points can illuminate how culture and identity function in the university. Rather than culture merely

representing identity, as is the case with bureaucracy-imposed identities, the global city and perhaps the newly emerging university reverses this relationship, allowing culture instead to *produce* its own identity.

LESSONS FROM THE GLOBAL CITY

To clarify this concept, let us return to the image of the Ivory Tower. This is the university of George Keller's 1983 book, *Academic Strategy*. As Keller's subtitle, *The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*, suggests, he applied a business planning recipe to universities. One step in that recipe was to scan the external environment for threats and opportunities. For the purposes of our argument, "external" is the operative word. The environment was outside the university, influencing it, though removed. Philanthropy funded research, for example, with little attempt to guide or shape the way funds were used.

Keller's notions about strategy were immensely popular in the 80s. *Academic Strategy* became a best-seller, and Keller became a somewhat larger-than-life advisor to presidents and boards. Keller called for strong leaders at the top and systematic forms of support. Today, however, many leaders find Keller's text wrong as a form of strategic planning, even though some may not know why it seems inadequate.

Through our experience of working and thinking at Emory, we too have learned that such formulas do not work well in practice today. Rather than rules and habits, we intend for the contours of our culture to inform what we do and how we advance. Rather than attempting to measure the external environment, we are more interested in our capacity to influence that environment, to shape it to our needs. Since 1994 Emory has used a systematic process to reflect on its consistent growth since 1980, its fairly sudden rise in national prominence, and its aspirations for the future. Emory's size (11,000 students; 2400 faculty, about half in the School of Medicine), endowment (sixth among American universities), and relative youth as a major research university give us a unique flexibility – along with strict limits imposed by a budget that is committed fully to existing priorities. Enhancements have to compete for funds. To accomplish this reflection, we crafted planning methods that build connections with faculty and designed studies to answer timely questions and also to increase cultural support. We constantly investigate ideas that work at Emory. By emulating them in the environment that nurtured them, we aim to increase the likelihood of success.

Now we are applying four lessons that might further reinforce the link between the university and the global city. First, we have found that *faculty*

passion advances the university. Faculty invent through their own passion the important academic programmes that form the solid future of a university. Neither organisational, governmental, nor industrial mandates can do as much, in part because (as in the global city), intellectual culture – not bureaucratic structure – eventually produces the identity of the institution. For example, in a personal interview about how academic programmes develop, a scholar of religion at Emory has emphasised the way his faculty seminars on science and religion first developed informally through a network that included a physics professor. The two scholars began an informal intellectual dialogue that led to more formal structures. Strikingly, the religion professor emphasises the spontaneous nature of the seminars' origin, noting that his inclusion in a collegial network – what James Bess has called “collegiality as culture” or simply “c-collegiality” (Bess 1992) – allowed new ideas to come about informally (“the idea just came to us”) and new connections to appear (“then I just happened to run into the guy who directs the science and society program”).² Through these initial acquaintances and the resulting entrepreneurial passion to locate funding for a project, the informal seminars soon developed into an undergraduate class, standing as a model for later interdisciplinary endeavors.

In order to advance their interests, some scholars persist in spite of departmental traditions that stand in the way of collaboration across schools. A director of the Emory programme on African American Studies called this force “a passionate commitment to the topic,” remarking that it is easier to lead when the driving force is beyond obligation or duty. In addition to providing vision, these leaders do not allow academic traditions to become bureaucratic barriers. Instead they cross boundaries successfully by using their collegial networks to secure financial as well as intellectual resources (Frost et al. 2001, p. 6).

To help these leaders, we have asked: how can we achieve a simpler, more enabling bureaucracy, a structure that is adequately flexible to meet the needs of faculty? If there seems to be a divide between faculty's intellectual passion and leaders' more bureaucratic authority, how can we link intellect and authority in a better way? How can we remove barriers that impede progress? In the university as global city, our task is to address these questions now, and not wait for them to resolve themselves or simply disappear.

The intellectual passions of faculty alone, then, are not enough. The second lesson is that *the culture should recognise and support the faculty's passion.* One powerful event at Emory was a 10-year seminar series that brought faculty together for a period of one semester to think about a topic of interest to them. The programme, known as the Luce Seminars, created a

structure for broad relationships between faculty with diverse disciplinary perspectives. Most faculty received some release time for the seminars, and the seminars were often perceived as a time of learning for its own sake. Thus the seminars not only fostered an interdisciplinary community but also served a symbolic function by pointing to Emory's investment in intellectual development without thought of more grants or new classes. For many participants, the seminars were career changing, leading to new ways to address research questions, collaborate with others, or teach (Frost & Jean 2000).

Leaders at other institutions make this point also.³ At some leading US universities, there is a continual affirmation of people and programmes rather than particular buildings or administrative structures. At Harvard, for example, leaders talk more about faculties than about schools, emphasising the importance of collegiality and scholarship over architecture. Even when new programmes do begin from an administrative initiative, it is striking to hear the emphasis on faculty passion that underlies these new endeavors, rather than talk about the marketplace or other external drivers. Leaders at these universities seem to recognise that unless intellectual passion is the foundation of a programme, the programme will lack sustainable strength. Once this passion is defined, leaders provide subtle structural help. In other words, these leaders seem less ready to push a process with structures than to help new processes develop in almost invisible ways. The ethos of listening to faculty ideas and then helping convert those ideas into programmes and projects is at the heart of these universities. It is crucial to their excellence.

Therefore, we can say that a third lesson to reinforce the link between the university and the global city recognises that *structured support can enable culture*. In his 1992 study, Bess noted that structures designed to foster collegiality may signal the lack of the more influential culturally-rooted form. Although he never explicitly stated it, Bess was already calling for structures that do not strive to take the place of cultural collegiality, but rather seek to enable cultural collegiality. Our experiences advance his point: while strengthening the culture is a bit like building castles in the air, it is possible to strengthen *structures* to give that work some form. The best structures are flexible and inviting, not complex or rigid. They have more to do with local responsiveness than global uniformity. It is easier to build these attributes into new structures than to change an old structure and establish new norms.

For this reason, and this is the fourth element of our learning, *cultural trust depends on open structures*. At the universities we have studied, the most effective structures recognise the powerful organisational differences

that occur across institutions and within them. What works at Chicago, for example, might not work at Brown. What works in a scientific institute at Northwestern might not work in the social policy institute across the street. Rather than complicating matters, skillful leaders use these differences to help enabling structures to form (Chopp et al. 2001). When structures are open, passion, culture, and structure are more likely to come together to produce knowledge, and faculty are more likely to trust the work. Planning, for example, consists of continuous conversations, rather than more competitive, dead-line oriented forms. We never say a process is over. Findings are always open to review and change.

Concerning one change of plans, in the mid-90s some Emory faculty responded with scepticism to their colleagues' recommendation to form a university-wide teaching center, while others stressed that they would support such an initiative only if resources were organised not from the top down, but at the local levels of the schools and departments. The university leaders heeded this caution and decided instead to form a teaching council to support grassroots improvements. To keep resources close to faculty, the council currently sponsors seminars and short-term programmes, for example, rather than funding full-time professional staff. Now most agree that attention to teaching is greater than before the council began its work. Of course, the fact remains that Emory is a research university where faculty are judged primarily on their research. However, now faculty are required to demonstrate teaching excellence for tenure or promotion. Moreover, there has generally developed an atmosphere in which conversations about teaching not only happen, but are expected. They help define an acknowledged shared pursuit (Frost & Teodorescu 2000).

However, because the most effective leadership arises from a careful understanding and familiarity with the culture of each specific university, one can use no simple recipes to bring about such change. We needed to ask: what are some specific Emory characteristics on which we can build? To answer this question, we undertook studies such as our investigation of intellectual initiatives, to which we referred in the paragraphs above (Frost et al. 2001). We began this study assuming that, if properly shaped and supported, intellectual initiatives across disciplines and schools can expand the ways we create and transmit knowledge, strengthen intellectual connections, and contribute to a university that is more than the sum of its parts. Our goal was to look within the faculty body for the most promising work, to learn how leaders had advanced it, and then to make this learning available to other potential leaders.

First we defined the term "intellectual initiative" to include programmes or activities involving faculty from at least two of Emory's schools *and* a

strong component of research. From a list of about 40 initiatives – from a neuroscience center which has \$20 million in National Institutes of Health funds to tiny, almost informal clusters of faculty who meet to advance some specific intellectual purpose – we chose twelve initiatives for in-depth study. An early result was one important lesson: interdisciplinarity for its own sake is not an initiative. We placed this term and point of view in deep background, and encouraged the subject matter to come forward.

We also learned that most intellectual initiatives begin with a scholar who has a particular vision for advancing knowledge. These exceptional faculty members, who combine scholarly expertise, intellectual passion, and daily commitment, seem to be keys to the success of the initiatives – and to the future of the institution as a distinct entity. A key element to our vision, not only for these initiatives but our overall leadership, became encouraging the work of passionate faculty leaders – our best way of working within the global city model.

This study and others have deepened our understanding of the faculty passion that is the prime shaper of the university. On one hand, as university leaders, we have an obligation to use this passion to increase our institution's excellence. On the other hand, the university can diminish passion if political obstacles get in the way. For example, when faculty try to build a programme around a passion, our early reaction should be supportive, not bureaucratic. Instead of asking the deans for formal support before the likelihood of success is clear, we realised that the provost – by facilitating internal communication – should match passion with modest forms of support, watch the progress, and seek more formal support later in the development process. If the process is handled properly, then faculty view the university as a helpful partner rather than a bureaucratic obstacle.

The study of intellectual initiatives is simply one way we have learned from our own patterns. It is a way to harness forces that are already at play within our own institution and to enable these forces to foster change that will receive passionate support from the faculty. By attending to the patterns that are already emerging, it may be possible to develop universities more according to the global city model than the model of the bureaucratic metropolis.

APPLYING LESSONS, GUIDING CHANGE

Ultimately, then, how does one shape a university? Our findings suggest that organising principles are more effective when they come from the intellectual passions of people, and not from the more artificial needs of bureaucracy. These organic structures should be helpful, light and flexible,

not demanding and heavy. In fact, we are coming to believe that such terms as “planning” – or even “choosing” – are not quite accurate to describe the practices of shaping the university as global city. Instead, we believe that leaders should spend more time guiding evolution and lifting up the passions than forming requirements to govern the whole.

Guiding evolution means focusing effort, insisting on flexibility, and attending to the pace of change. It also means crafting and delivering the messages that help a university become more than the sum of its parts. Such an open approach to change should highlight the powerful differences that mark universities. By helping faculty to invent through their own passion the important academic programmes that eventually form the future of a university, for example, the particular identity of the institution will advance.

These findings raise, however, a more compelling question than the one with which we began. Is the university as global city a model we ought to try to achieve? And if so, can it endure? Or as humans, are our natural tendencies to organise so strong that any system is doomed to evolve into a stifling or unproductive imposition? This question cannot be resolved now precisely because it is a question that will always haunt our attempts to guide a global city-like university. By revealing some ways to advance a university produced by its own culture, perhaps we have, however, articulated new goals for guiding change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Susan Frost is vice president for strategic development and adjunct professor in the Graduate Division of the Liberal Arts and the Division of Educational Studies at Emory University, and Aimee Pozorski graduated from the doctoral programme in English there. Rebecca Chopp is president and professor of philosophy and religion at Colgate University. The authors thank graduate student David Kelman for his contribution to this paper. To contact the authors, see below.

NOTES

1. See Chopp (2001) for a discussion of the applicability of these models to the university.
2. From a personal interview conducted in preparation for “Beyond the Founding Fratricidal Conflict” (Chopp 2001).
3. From 1995 to 2002, Frost visited 11 private research universities in the U.S. for talks with administrative leaders and faculty who are shaping their university. Frost’s experience and her records of those meetings have informed this essay where noted.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P.S. & Borys, B. (1996). Two Types of Bureaucracy: Enabling and Coercive, *Administrative Science Quarterly* **41**, 61–89.
- Bender, T. (ed.) (1998). *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bender, T. & Schorske, C.E. (eds) (1998). *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bess, J.L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a Clarification of Meaning and Function. In J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 8. New York: Agathon, 1–36.
- Breneman, D.W. (2002). For Colleges, This is Not Just Another Recession, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 14), 1–9.
- Chopp, R.S. (2001). *Beyond the Founding Fratricidal Conflict: Scholarship of Religion and a Renewed Public Academy*. Presidential Address to the American Academy of Religion. Denver, Colorado, November 17.
- Chopp, R.S., Frost, S.H. & Jean, P.M. (2001). What's Old is New Again: Alternative Strategies for Supporting Faculty, *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* (November/December), 43–46.
- Clark, B. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in a Cross-National Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cole, J. (1993). Balancing Acts: Dilemmas of Choice Facing Research Universities, *Daedalus* **122**(4), 1–36.
- Frost, S.H. (1998). Using Scholarship: Lessons for Practice at One University. *Research in Higher Education* **19**(2), 219–234.
- Frost, S.H. & Jean, P.M. (2000). Making More of Faculty Culture: An Experiment in Building Intellectual Community, *Tertiary Education and Management* **6**(3), 227–243.
- Frost, S.H., Jean, P.M., Teodorescu, D. & Brown, A.B. (2001). *Intellectual Initiatives at a Research University: Origins, Evolutions, and Challenges*. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Richmond, Virginia, November.
- Frost, S.H. & Teodorescu, D. (2001). Teaching Excellence: How Faculty Guided Change at a Research University, *Review of Higher Education* **24**(4), 397–415.
- Hearn, J. (1993). Strategy and Resources: Economic Issues in Strategic Planning and Management in Higher Education. In J.C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol. 6. New York: Agathon, 212–281.
- Hirschhorn L. (1997). *Reworking Authority: Leading and Following in the Post-modern Organization*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press and the American Association for Higher Education.
- Kerr, C. (1963). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- O'Brien, G.D. (1998). *All the Essential Half-Truths about Higher Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to Lead in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, S. (1998). *Globalization and Its Discontents*. New York: The New Press.
- Sassen, S. (2000). *Cities in a World Economy*, 2nd edn. *Sociology for a New Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive University Structures: An Analysis of Adaptation to Socio-economic Environments of US and European Universities*, Higher Education Series 54. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Veysey, L. (1965). *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Weick, K. (1976). Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems, *Administrative Science Quarterly* **21**, 1–19.

Emory University
108 Administration Building
Atlanta, GA 30322
USA
E-mail: sfrost@emory.edu