Research in Higher Education, Vol. 39, No. 2, 1998

AIR **Research and Practice**

USING SCHOLARSHIP: Lessons for Practice at One University

Susan H. Frost

In this essay the author views a collection of scholarship as a source of lessons related to institutional practice and considers how institutional planners and other administrative leaders can use such ideas. The collection includes "Balancing Acts: Dilemmas of Choice Facing Research Universities," by Jonathan Cole; "Crafting Strategy," by Henry Mintzberg; portions of the book *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life,* by Robert Kegan; "Collegiality: Toward a Clarification of Meaning and Function," by James Bess; and "On the Nature of Institutional Research and the Knowledge and Skills It Requires," by Patrick Terenzini. Although the author draws from experience at one research university, the conclusions may prove useful to those who plan for the future of other higher education institutions.

As the first in an occasional series designed to illustrate the connection between higher education research and the day-to-day challenges of decision makers in institutions, systems, and governing bodies, this essay considers how selected pieces of scholarship may influence real world strategic management. Here I review a small collection of scholarship and then explore some ways the authors' findings and ideas have helped advance one university's effort to shape its future. Although I draw from experience at Emory University, the conclusions may prove useful to those who plan for the future of other higher education institutions, especially research universities in today's environment.

The scholarship includes "Balancing Acts: Dilemmas of Choice Facing Research Universities," by Jonathan Cole (1993); "Crafting Strategy," by Henry Mintzberg (1987); portions of the book *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life,* by Robert Kegan (1994); "Collegiality: Toward a Clarification of Meaning and Function," by James Bess (1992); and "On the Nature of Institutional Research and the Knowledge and Skills It Requires," by Patrick

Susan H. Frost, Emory University, 108 Administration Building, Atlanta, GA 30322; e-mail: sfrost@emory.edu.

0361-0365/98/0400-0219$15.00/0 © 1998 Human Sciences Press, Inc.

Terenzini (1993). I chose these five of the dozens of articles I have reviewed in my capacity as vice provost for institutional planning and research at Emory, because they have contributed directly to either the justification for or processes of Emory's effort. Only Cole's piece was read widely on campus; the others have influenced my own direction and through me have helped inform the university's leadership and certain faculty groups charged with contributing to Emory's development.

More specifically, each piece can be described as offering a helpful lesson on change. Cole's (1993) analysis of the dilemmas confronting U.S. research universities, for example, provided the common ground that allowed many of Emory's constituencies to explore both the historical and contemporary challenges facing research universities, including Emory. In their respective essays on crafting strategy and using conflict, Mintzberg (1987) and Kegan (1994) helped shape ways we have worked. By suggesting methods for ensuring change that is both lasting and deep, their insights deepened my understanding of the nature of useful outcomes and some ways they might be achieved. Bess's (1992) article on collegiality takes the reader deeper into the academic culture. By illuminating some complexities of the culture we at Emory seek to shape, he suggested where new ideas and support for them might be found. Terenzini's (1993) views on distinct forms of organizational intelligence indicated prerequisites for the work.[1]

In later sections of this essay, I will explore these lessons. It may be helpful to begin with a brief account of Emory's story. Emory is both typical and atypical of other U.S. universities, and the degree of each helps determine the generalizability and limitations of this account. One limitation relates to Emory's funding base. As a private university, Emory depends on return on endowment, not support from a state government, to help fund its activities. As one of the country's wealthier institutions, Emory is often perceived as having the capacity to afford any initiative it deems wise to achieve, and therefore it is perceived to be unlike some other universities. However, Emory's funds are committed to ongoing operations and each new initiative comes with the requirement that choices be made about what to fund and what to suspend or decline to begin. In this way, Emory is typical of other universities, where some good ideas and worthy work must be put aside because the capacity to support the work is not there.

ONE UNIVERSITY SHAPES ITS FUTURE

In 1994 the Carnegie Foundation classified Emory University as a Research I institution for the first time, and the next year Emory was elected to membership in the Association of American Universities, composed of the top research

institutions in the U.S. Both designations acknowledged the university's transformation from a regional school more focused on teaching in the 1970s to the national research university it is today. The growth marking the transformation is striking.

A gift set this period of growth in motion. In 1979, Emory received $105 million, at that time the largest single donation to a U.S. higher education institution. After a time of reflective study, President James Laney charged the faculty with building Emory's strongest programs to positions of national prominence (Laney, 1980, 1987). Soon the teaching university with a substantial clinical medical complex enlarged many programs and improved quality on all fronts. For example, from 1977 to 1993 Emory's full-time faculty increased by 67%, enrollment increased by 45%, the number of Ph.D.s awarded increased by 38%, and from 1987 to 1993 funds to support research increased by 110%. Some programs attained national prominence and many others aspired to the top tier of their peers.[2]

However, during the last years of this period escalating costs slowed the rate of growth for Emory and most other universities in the U.S. As many universities were cutting programs and allowing maintenance of facilities to lag, the slowed rate caused some of Emory's schools and departments to claim that shrinking resources were limiting their attempts to build faculty size and increase quality. Although this slowing was less severe at Emory, the magnitude of the change was similar to that at universities going from periods of normal growth to near-retrenchment positions. By 1994, Emory's future strength depended on both its capacity and willingness to make wise choices about how its resources were to be invested.

Also in 1994 Emory began searching for a successor to long-time President Laney. During the search, Provost Billy Frye served as interim president. Frye invited faculty, staff, students, and alumni to take part in a series of conversations about the future of the university. Although senior leaders and deans routinely discussed aspirations for Emory as a whole, many faculty found that directing their attention to the university as a whole was somewhat new.

The conversations resulted in Frye's document, *Choices & Responsibility: Shaping Emory's Future*, which was published in 1994 and strongly supported by the new president, William Chace. In *Choices & Responsibility*, Frye described the goal of Emory's effort as modification of its culture. He refers to the organizational culture, one of four cultures Burton Clark describes as "nested groupings" or sources of ideology and belief (1983, p. 75).[3] Based on accounts of the conversations and his own experience and insight, Frye articulated five issues that seem central to Emory's future: Emory aspires to raise the value of teaching and of interdisciplinary scholarship, build a stronger community, meet needs for infrastructure, and extend its array of external relationships. Such

change requires altering the basis on which decisions are made not just at the university level but also in the schools and departments, where faculty determine the relative value of the various forms of faculty work.

Then building on *Choices & Responsibility*, Frye invited faculty first to explore the relative levels of interest and need for immediate change in each of the five areas and then to discuss particular strategies for improvement. Frye also continued to deepen the involvement of the deans and other university leaders. In 1995, *Choices & Responsibility* was adopted as Emory's value platform by the university's trustees.

To accomplish Emory's goals, we at the university must understand Emory in the context of both its history and its place in contemporary American higher education, imagine the nature of the university we desire to become, identify the required enhancements or corrections, and determine their relative worth. Although Emory's unique culture and requirements have determined both the style and substance of the effort, investigation of and reflection on the broader world are important as well.

NEW TWISTS ON FAMILIAR THEMES: DILEMMAS OF THE RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT

Recognizing that many knowledgeable insiders are worried about the future of higher education, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences devoted the Fall 1993 issue of its journal, *Daedalus*, to challenges facing the research university and the quality of some proposed solutions. In the opening article, "Balancing Acts: Dilemmas of Choice Facing Research Universities," Columbia provost Jonathan Cole cast the challenges in terms of balancing acts that universities must perform as they confront new variations on themes that have long concerned this important segment of U.S. higher education.

As Cole points out, the generic issues are not new. Linked fundamentally to the basic structure of research universities and usually at work below the surface, these issues have emerged in reaction to economic constraint and social conflict. As a consequence, universities face certain dilemmas of choice, each calling into question basic premises on which research institutions are organized.

First Cole addresses a dilemma concerning governance. In a time when both knowledge and costs are growing exponentially, how do universities allocate support? Who decides what to expand, what to maintain, what to contract, and what to eliminate? What lends legitimacy to the process of choosing? In the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, when resources were growing rapidly, decisions about allocation were less profound. Now such decisions go to the very heart of the academic enterprise.

The second dilemma concerns power of a different sort—the power to judge

the degree to which the organizing principles of the university are right or wrong. This power is like that of framing the null hypothesis for statistical testing. The null hypothesis is a statement, or "truth," that a researcher sets forth and then attempts through experimentation to prove false. Because proving a null hypothesis false usually requires one to show that a pattern of occurrence could not take place by chance, the null hypothesis is difficult to overturn (Cole, 1993, pp. 11–23). Therefore the group with the power to name the "truth" stands to control the conclusions that the research will establish.

Cole's analogy becomes persuasive when he reminds readers that our core values—meritocracy, rationality, organized skepticism, and access to the free marketplace of ideas—are at stake (p. 13). For example, the value of merit as a basis for judging an individual's performance is deeply ingrained in the academy. We admit students; award degrees; and hire, promote, and tenure faculty on the basis of merit. Upholding merit as a true measure of excellence and extending it to the next generation is far simpler than overturning it and establishing competing criteria in its place. In this light, it is clear that naming the "truth" carries with it the power to set forth standards and practices, and perhaps the power for deciding the nature and degree of change the academy will tolerate.

The requirement to strike a proper balance between the demands of research and of teaching is Cole's third dilemma. To demonstrate their legitimacy, research universities must do well at both research and teaching. The dilemma results in part from competition among the departments of top institutions to be one of the top 5 or 10 in the nation. Standing is based on reputation for research, and those faculty who enhance this reputation benefit most from the system of reward. Accordingly, the question becomes: How can the system be reshaped to raise the level of commitment to teaching and not lower the emphasis on research? Cole offers several suggestions, each designed to recognize and extend teaching quality while not lowering standards for research.[4] If adopted, over time the suggestions might have the effect of producing evidence of commitment to excellent teaching.

The fourth dilemma concerns the partnership between research universities and the federal government. How can sources of support be enriched without changing the research environment in unacceptable ways? As a university maintains or extends its research mission, what is sacrificed, at what cost, and to achieve what goals? Cole suggests that solutions lie in closer partnerships among the federal government, U.S. industry, and the research university, and he lists six existing problems that those seeking workable solutions should address.

Placing the dilemmas in the context of development since 1945, Cole does not foresee the demise of the research university as we know it. Rather, univer-

sities that successfully resolve the dilemmas will move into the future with important strategic advantages over their peers, he predicts (p. 2).

Cole calls for action. Next we turn our attention to ideas about how useful change might occur.

STRATEGY: MORE CRAFT THAN PLAN

In his article "Crafting Strategy," Henry Mintzberg uses the metaphor of the potter to draw the reader into his exploration of real world strategy-making for complex organizations (1987). A potter is one who practices a craft, going about the work slowly and deliberately, responsively and intuitively. Over time the product changes to reflect both the demands of the markets and the potter's own evolving style. The work may include false starts and abandoned attempts. It may also include encouraging breakthroughs and surprising successes. The potter's increasing competence and confidence keep the work dynamic and new.

Drawing on findings from a range of studies, Mintzberg uses the metaphor to engage the reader in imagining two contrasting conceptions of strategy formation: the planning and the crafting of strategy. More conventional conceptions of planning strategy bear scant resemblance to the work of the potter. Rather they bring to mind managers and experts cloistered to involve themselves in orderly processes of control, driven by reason, based on analysis, deliberate in nature. The product resembles a blueprint, an explicit guide to future development.

On the other hand, crafting strategy calls forth different images. Strategy is crafted not by isolated managers or consulting experts but by individuals who know the organization in a deep and intimate way. Like the work itself, the product is different as well. It is more likely to resemble a pattern than a blueprint, to emerge from disorderly debate than to be formulated from rational steps. Even work that seems unfocused or confusing brings about learning, thereby building the capacity for the crafting to continue. The most basic connection is between thought and action (Mintzberg, 1987, p. 68). The very act of working increases the knowledge that crafters need to take the next steps.

Although Mintzberg uses examples from business, certain of his ideas are particularly relevant to the university. For example, Mintzberg describes one approach to planning as a blend of control and support, reflecting leadership's intention to govern the process while inviting participants to come forward with ideas. A goal is not to foster constant evaluation and change but to find that balance of change and stability that best supports a natural and creative synthesis of the future, past, and present (p. 75). Especially in the university, it is important to recognize strengths and remove barriers to their development, make judgments based on the current and future worth of declining compo-

nents, and cultivate leadership at all levels. One way to accomplish this last objective is to draw potential leaders into the work of crafting. As they help shape the future of the university, they learn its existing rhythms and patterns as well.

As one might imagine, leading such work requires skill and understanding. Like the potter, the leader must be in tune with the work, the tools and materials of the work, and the publics for which the work is intended. Unlike the potter, university leaders do not craft alone. Success depends on using those aspects of crafting that Mintzberg describes—the disorderly debate, the false starts, and the emerging notions—to the best advantage of the community. Effective leaders have a strong sense of both the organization and the individuals, the ability to pace stability and change, and the intimacy with past discontinuities that enables one to predict future directions. A goal is to transform individual insight and energy into a collective force for change.

USING CONFLICT TO ADVANCE THE VISION

In the book *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life* (1994),[5] psychologist Robert Kegan cites a distinction Ronald Heifitz and Riley Sinder draw between two leaders. The first leader meets two criteria for success: the ability to craft and communicate a coherent vision or purpose, and the ability to enlist individuals to identify with or work toward that vision or purpose. The first criterion requires the leader to generate and communicate ideas; the second tests the leader's capacity to engage people in turning those ideas into realities. That the required skills are different suggests that a person who has one talent might fail to lead effectively because the other talent is lacking (pp. 321–322).

The other leader has a different goal. Rejecting the notion that a vision is a gift from the leader to those who will share it, this leader assumes that a vision based on any one perspective remains incomplete. This leader (1) provides a context in which all can create a purpose, which all in turn can uphold, and (2) works to encourage participants not merely to accommodate difference but to look on the successful handling of difference as a route to a more complete view. When conflict arises, this leader is unlikely to wish away either of the conflicting views but to use them to reach more complete, more useful solutions to the challenge at hand.

The style of the second leader should resonate with faculty because it parallels the evolution of the disciplines. In a discipline, progress occurs when one scholar challenges the thinking of another, causing once-accepted assumptions to be questioned and perhaps to fall, others to rise to favor, and knowledge to be transformed. If the discipline continues to mature, this process of criticism or conflict, investigation, reflection, and evaluation repeats itself and knowledge

increases.[6] As Kegan notes, the ability to draw away from the argument, review the evidence, and consider a new position is an essential scholarly skill. The capacity to change thinking is a mark of rich intellectual discourse.[7]

Conflict can transform in other settings as well. Kegan suggests that we imagine work settings as discourse communities. There are several kinds of discourse, some more useful or productive than others. One potentially transformative discourse involves inner contradiction.[8] To explore the nature of contradiction, one begins by expressing a commitment and then examining the action or the absence of action that prevents the commitment from being realized. Often, close examination reveals that a fundamental assumption is in the way.[9]

Changing the assumption is a bit more difficult. We are reluctant to change our fundamental assumptions because doing so requires us to alter our notions of reality. However, the work of transforming assumptions is not done alone. The support of one or two others who understand the challenge or conflict can be most helpful.

Using conflict as a means of transformation requires one to become alert to the influence of assumptions, identify instances that oppose the logic of the assumption, look for sources of holding the assumption true, and be willing to test change, at least on a modest basis. When problems are solved quickly, it is likely that only external conditions are altered. It is not likely that that meaningful change has been achieved. To use conflict to shape the discourse, one should slow the pace of moving through problems to solutions and nurture conditions that support lasting change. Although this way of working has different requirements, it can establish or strengthen important connections including, for example, collegiality among participants.

COLLEGIALITY: AN ENRICHING DIMENSION OF CULTURE

Even cursory acquaintance with the work of Mintzberg or Kegan brings to mind questions about collegiality. Both Mintzberg and Kegan advocate ways of working that both depend on and foster collegial relationships. Where does one find collegiality? How does one recognize it? If it exists, how can it best be used to support desired change? If it is absent or too weak to be useful, how can it be strengthened? The answers to these questions can affect the essence of the university and the quality of countless individual relationships as well.

Collegiality is difficult to define. To help illuminate its complexity, in the article "Collegiality: Toward a Clarification of Meaning and Function," James Bess considers collegiality in terms of the language one uses to describe it, the value one assigns to it, and the functions it performs. One goal of Bess's study is to reach closer agreement on what constitutes collegiality and shed light on

ways its elements can be controlled for the benefit of the educational enterprise (1992, pp. 1–2).

Before exploring Bess's claims about collegiality, it is helpful to understand his use of the term *culture*. For the purposes of his study, Bess describes culture as the framework that influences and is influenced by decision making and by the behavior of people making those decisions (p. 6). Culture represents the accumulated basic assumptions of community members and exerts influence in subtle or invisible ways. As community members recruit or allow new members to join their ranks, they may reinforce the culture and provide routes to extend it, or they may contribute to change.

Throughout the university, however, culture is not homogeneous. Even in its heterogeneity, it is inconsistent or ambiguous when, for example, a department voices support for increased interdisciplinarity at the university level and uses its funds only to support the programs it controls. In this case, strong disciplinary structures can fail to advance cooperation across fields, even though the university might claim such a goal. Thus the culture influences not only the behavior of individuals (who cooperate less than they might) but supports the structures that help define the nature of the place (which in turn remain more closed than they might).

Bess uses the concepts "academic culture" and "organizational structure" to draw distinctions between types of collegiality one is likely to find. Cultural collegiality is at once part of the nature of the specific university and part of the larger culture that colleges and universities share. At its strongest, this type of collegiality is deeply embedded in the fabric of a university, supporting the notion that professional values protect individual rights.

As Bess notes, cultural collegiality appears to exist without support from formal structures such as faculty senates or other forms of governance designed to protect professional prerogative. In fact, where cultural collegiality is strong, these existing structures are understood to be collegial even though formal protection of individual prerogative is virtually unnecessary. For example, when cultural collegiality is strong, faculty do not need senates to protect their rights and customs. These defining aspects are protected by the norms of the culture, which define the essence of the place (Bess, 1992, p. 9).

On the other hand, if cultural collegiality is not strong, then structures can be useful. Senates, for example, can assure that faculty have a voice in deciding which units a university supports and in resolving the competing claims on resources that inevitably arise. Used to describe long-term conditions rather than forms of crisis management, structural collegiality tends to be integrating or even controlling at times. As Bess points out, the value of structural collegiality lies not in the structure itself but in the function it performs.

This brief review of Bess's essay only hints at its complexity. As Bess suggests, although collegiality does not guarantee institutional quality, it appears to

provide a means of inducing members to cooperate and work in more integrative ways. In addition, collegiality provides incentives for striving toward institutionally sanctioned goals and putting forward consistent images to outside groups. Embedded in the concept are two essential outlooks of faculty: rationality and trust in others. When these are lacking, the likelihood of finding collegiality is not high (p. 33).

SUPPORTING STRATEGIC CHANGE

In the article "On the Nature of Institutional Research and the Knowledge and Skills It Requires," Patrick Terenzini (1993) calls on institutional researchers[10] to acquire three forms of institutional intelligence: technical and analytical intelligence, or factual knowledge and methodological competencies; issues intelligence, or familiarity with the specific organization and the people who manage it; and contextual intelligence, including a deeper understanding of the culture of higher education in general and of one's institution in particular. Terenzini's insight relies on years of investigating the outcomes of higher education, and his distinctions affirm the specific complexities of most institutions. Accepting the distinctions and keeping in mind that the "ability to apply one's intelligence in a higher tier implies possession of the intelligence characteristic of the lower tiers" (p. 3), one would recognize contextual intelligence as necessary to Emory's effort to shape its future.

Contextual intelligence depends on understanding the patterns and textures of one's institution including, for example, its customs and traditions, historical and philosophical evolution, formal and informal political structures, and processes of making decisions; or, in other words, knowing how business is done in one particular place (Terenzini, 1993, p. 6). Because it depends on the savvy and wisdom that only experience can bring, perhaps contextual intelligence can be achieved through on-the-job training.

There may be ways to hasten the process, however. Terenzini suggests two exceptions to his rule of experience: reading a good institutional history as a means to understanding historical origins, customs, traditions, and evolution; and reading the latest regional accreditation self-study report. Spending some time with these resources can help not only sort out the sequence of actual events but also suggest the nature of the forces driving change.

My experience suggests that other useful strategies include borrowing from the savvy and wisdom of colleagues. One might begin by seeking individuals with long or rich experience to ask: What are the narratives of this place? What truths and myths have shaped our longings and our fears? What is the language we share? When one absorbs the narratives and adopts the language, then one can move from outsider to newcomer to participant in the discourse on which the culture depends.[11]

THREE LESSONS THE SCHOLARSHIP SUGGESTS

As I consider the influence of these readings on my work at Emory, three lessons seem clear:

- Processes that encourage the folding together of many points of view may be more useful than processes that allow ideas to be considered in more linear or isolated ways. Success seems to flow not from proceeding from one clearly defined concept or decision to the next but from continual, though not always straightforward, progress toward outcomes many help to form.
- Notions of balance seemed to help planners move from the necessity to choose among alternatives to a more imaginative goal of linking or synthesizing them. Strength seems to come not from a capacity to tolerate jarring change but from the ability to connect past reality to a vision of the future. Modification, not deep or sudden change, may be the aspiration we should claim.
- In our discussions, it has proved more productive to place conflicting views on the table than to shield them from discussion. However, we discuss conflicting views more productively, it seems, within existing networks of collegiality than across them.

The first lesson calls to mind the essay by Mintzberg. Emory's effort to shape its future resembles a process of folding in, with strong similarities to Mintzberg's crafting analogy. For example, four years ago when the first conversation series was held, the provost asked the community, especially the faculty and deans, to help to identify the most important issues facing Emory in the next phase of its development. Specifically, he asked questions about perceptions of Emory's greatest strengths or opportunities, most serious weaknesses or challenges, and most important initiatives over the coming 5 to 10 years (*Choices & Responsibility*, p. 37). Then, folding the data into his own beliefs and experience, he produced *Choices & Responsibility*, which names five comprehensive issues along with a series of questions he invited the community to address.

The document, however, was not cast as a blueprint for the future but as an invitation to move from identification of concerns and opportunities to consideration of how the university's culture, policies, and structures should change to support the outcomes the community desired (*Choices & Responsibility*, p. 1). Frye followed this invitation with a second series of conversations for faculty, this time with a more structured format. During that series, each faculty group discussed one of the five issues, concentrating on the nature of desired change. Along with leadership's sense of what is right for the community, this series helped shape initiatives for early implementation.

Two issues clearly were of most interest: the need to bring better balance to

teaching and research and the need to foster interdisciplinary scholarship. By 1995 the university had taken definite steps toward change on both fronts. For example, in late 1995 the provost commissioned a group of faculty to investigate the status of teaching across Emory and recommend broad change if needed. After working for two years, this group put forward 10 recommendations. Other university-wide initiatives include providing funds for individual faculty to improve course design and classroom performance and a new council to increase coordination and sharing of resources among Emory's libraries. The success of each effort relies in part on allocations from a new central fund controlled by the president and the provost.

At the same time, other groups are exploring ways to strengthen the community. For example, work is underway on a master plan for the physical campus, with the strengthening of community through use of space as one of its goals. Although outside consultants are constructing the plan, they rely on detailed input from many Emory constituencies, periodically going to the community to check their ideas against reality. It is significant that none of these initiatives are proceeding in isolation. The quality of change depends on the success of all the initiatives. No single initiative can achieve the gains we desire.

In 1997 the conversation series and the annual retreats for deans and senior leaders also continue, with recent discussions directed more to specific initiatives than to broad concepts. This progress seems to reflect Mintzberg's calls for connection between thought and action. The provost's style also reflects this connection, as he quite naturally follows each thread of a conversation to its conclusion, always probing for specific ideas or examples of desired action and affirming the essential nature of the debate. Across the processes we are using, the "folding in" metaphor seems to apply. Success seems to flow not from proceeding from one clearly defined idea or decision to the next but instead from continual progress toward outcomes many are helping to form.

However, the useful processes are not necessarily straightforward and the completed portions seem more orderly in retrospect than they seemed at the time. Mintzberg's observation that crafting strategy can appear disorderly or confused rings true, even though there is nothing haphazard about the methods we use.

The second lesson relates to notions of balance. Describing universities as stable social systems, Cole (1993) casts the dilemmas he names in terms of balancing acts and observes that strong universities are connective, adaptive, and in search of higher levels of completeness. Frye uses the term also, calling on Emory not to find a new direction but to modify the balance between, for example, the value placed on research and the value placed on teaching; the investment in the long-held disciplinary structures that form universities and in newer, more nontraditional interdisciplinary arrangements; and the energy devoted to traditional educational programs and to more externally focused ef-

forts. Both Cole and Frye seem to suggest that a university's culture can be shaped over time; they fall short of calling for redesign.

At Emory, notions of balance seem to have advanced conversations about specific change. For example, the faculty group commissioned to investigate the status of teaching began its work with talk about how to balance teaching and research, disciplinary and interdisciplinary structures, and the need for evaluation of teaching to contribute to both the development of the teacher and decisions about that teacher's advancement. After careful discussion, the commission recommended that Emory make dual commitments to excellence in teaching and research (Commission on Teaching, 1997, p. 8), with some members of the commission preferring to endorse a more complete blending of the two (Aranson, 1997, September 15). Throughout the discussions, notions of balance seemed to help participants move from the necessity to choose between alternatives to a more imaginative goal of linking of the ideals, illustrating that strength seems to come not from a capacity to tolerate jarring change but from the ability to connect, adapt, and thereby become more complete. Modification may be the aspiration we should claim.[12]

Cole's ideas also have helped reveal another potential source of gain, bringing us to the third lesson. More than in the past, I am inclined to regard Emory's current progress as part of our unfolding history and regard our development over time as part of the evolution of higher education. In the disciplines, conflict (or contradiction, as Kegan terms it) traditionally has been one way to alter balances. In our discussions about Emory's future, it has proved more productive to place conflicting views on the table than to shield them from discussion. However, we discuss conflicting views more productively, it seems, within existing networks of collegiality than across them. If so, the questions become: Is conflict a resource we can use more systematically? What role might collegiality play? If conflict and collegiality are related in useful ways, how can the relationship be better used?

As Emory's effort suggests, collegiality is part of everything faculty wish for and value. To advance collegiality, we need to know more about its nature on our own campuses and on other campuses we hold dear. Bess suggests that collegiality exists in distinct forms, cultural and structural, for example. Do these distinctions reflect reality on the campuses we know? If so, can the forms be cultivated? How is each supported and extended? I suspect that trust is part of the answer, an idea that has opened avenues of ongoing exploration.

For institutional planners and others who aspire to shape a future, Mintzberg delivers a central message: The basic connection is between thought and action (p. 68). If this is a goal, can Terenzini's notions of contextual intelligence help achieve it? Perhaps his definitions of organizational intelligence hold requirements not just for institutional researchers but for other decision makers who aspire to Mintzberg's ideal. Could one use Terenzini's definitions to construct a

helpful curriculum? What are the details of such a course of study? Who should teach and who should learn?

When I reflect on the lessons with Mintzberg in mind, three additional gains come to mind. In the lessons discussed here, I find the impetus to reduce the random nature of my thinking, bring order to my questions, and replenish the imagination I bring to the work. In short, these lessons have added value to my practice, as has the scholarship from which they are formed.

Acknowledgments. Helpful comments and criticisms of earlier versions of this article were made by Eleanor Hutchens, Pat Terenzini, three unnamed reviewers, and Associate Editor of the journal, Jim Hearn. The author thanks them for their careful attention and insight.

NOTES

1. The ideas these authors present are based for the most part on accumulated empirical analysis. For discussion of the tendency of the discipline of higher education to move away from practice- and policy-related research toward a more scholastic focus, see Terenzini (1996). In an address to higher education scholars, Terenzini recommended that the trend be reversed. He suggested that scholars recognize higher education as a multidisciplinary, applied field and reconsider why they do research and write.
2. From 1977 to the present, the full-time faculty increased 90%, enrollment increased 49%, and Ph.D.s awarded increased 100%. From 1987 to the present, sponsored research increased 170%.
3. Clark names the following cultures or forces that influence faculty attitudes and behaviors: the culture of the disciplines, the primary going concerns of academic systems; the culture of the enterprise, which is generated by and attached to universities and colleges as organizations; the culture of the profession, in this case the community of scholars; and the culture of the national system as a whole. Clark claims that "academic systems are ideologically rich in part because they provide a plurality of nested groupings that manufacture culture as part of their work and self interest" (1983, pp. 75–99).
4. The real challenge is to "recognize and facilitate demonstrated quality in teaching performance among brilliant researchers" (p. 28). Cole recommends that research universities raise expectations and rewards for teaching excellence, require all members of the permanent faculty to teach well, consider teaching performance in every decision to hire or promote, raise the visibility of teaching in the university community, and help brilliant young scholars become excellent teachers.
5. See especially pp. 307–355.
6. In the book *Intellect and Public Life* (1993), Bender chronicles the development of some of the disciplines, as does Geiger in the book *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940* (1986). Both authors illustrate this pattern.
7. Kegan made this point during a discussion at the Harvard Graduate School of Education Management Development Program in 1995. Other of Kegan's ideas as expressed there and during a visit to Emory in 1996 are included in this discussion of his work. Kegan explores other ideas related to discourse communities in *In Over Our Heads*, pp. 288–290.
8. Kegan names another discourse, NBC, or nagging, bitching, and complaining. This form has little apparent capacity to transform. However, NBC does indicate some level of caring, because one does not complain if one does not care. In some instances, even complaint can become a doorway to change.

9. For one view of a university as a discourse community, see Frost et al. (1997). In the article, the authors investigate ways that a lack of exchange across and within university constituencies can be seen as a lost opportunity for informed debate. When debate is avoided, the university risks losing the gains that can come from exploring all facets of intellectual tension. If used rather than avoided, such debate might exploit value of these tensions and thus contribute to the strategic advantage to the university.
10. As used in this paper, the terms *institutional researcher* and *institutional planner* are for the most part interchangeable. I acknowledge that in some cases institutional researchers do not function directly in the planning arena. However, as the present and the future of any institution are closely related, the two areas seem more usefully blended than isolated from each other.
11. My attempts to learn from the wisdom of Emory colleagues have led to some of my most prized collegial relationships. I encourage newcomers to a university administration to seek out experienced citizens of the community and learn from their insight.
12. However, mere modification of policy may also signal that relevant constituencies have not had opportunities to influence change. For discussion of this point, see Frost, Hearn, and Marine (1997).

REFERENCES

Aranson, P. (1997, September 15). Teaching and research are mutually inclusive. *Emory Report*, p. 4.

Bender, Thomas (1993). *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bess, James (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. In John C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, vol. 8 (pp. 5–36). New York: Agathon Press.

Clark, Burton R. (1983). *The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in a Cross-National Perspective.* Berkeley: the University of California Press.

Choices & Responsibility: Shaping Emory's Future (1994). Atlanta, GA: Emory University, Office of the Provost.

Cole, Jonathan (1993). Balancing acts: Dilemmas of choice facing research universities. *Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences: The American Research University* 22(4): 1–36.

Commission on Teaching (1997, September). *Teaching at Emory: The Report of the Commission on Teaching.* Atlanta: Emory University.

Frost, Susan H., Hearn, James C., and Marine, Ginger M. (1997). State policy and the public research university: A case study of manifest and latent tensions. *Journal of Higher Education* 68: 363–397.

Geiger, Roger (1986). *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kegan, Robert (1994). *In Over Our Heads: The Mental Demands of Modern Life.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Laney, James T. (1980, November 20). *The state of Emory, November 20, 1980, A report of the president to the trustees.* Atlanta: Emory University.

Laney, James T. (1987, April 16). *Emory 2000: An address to the university faculties.* Unpublished manuscript.

Mintzberg, Henry (1987, July/August). Crafting strategy. *Harvard Business Review,* 66–75.

Terenzini, Patrick T. (1993). On the nature of institutional research and the knowledge and skills it requires. *Research in Higher Education* 34(1): 1–10.

Terenzini, Patrick T. (1996). Rediscovering roots: Public policy and higher education research. *Review of Higher Education* 20(1): 5–13.

Copyright of Research in Higher Education is the property of Kluwer Academic Publishing and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.