DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 851 HE 008 079

AUTHOR	Cowley, W. H.
TITLE	What Every Professor Should Know About American Higher Education.
PUB DATE	28 Oct 60
NOTE	32p.; Paper presented before the faculty of the College of Business Administration, University of Akron (Akron, Ohio, October 1960) ; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; Organization; *Research; *Role Perception; *Student College Relationship; *Teacher Role; *Teaching

ABSTRACT

It might be desirable to have available for professors a book with the title "What Every Professor Should Know About American Higher Education." Some topics that could be included are the organization, function, and purpose of American colleges and universities. Other topics of importance needing examination are various teaching roles, the role of research, and the administrative process. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED127851

WHAT EVERY PROFESSOR SHOULD KNOW ABOUT AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION*

W. H. Cowley
David Jacks Professor of Higher Education
Stanford University

A series of books that had wide circulation during my distant boyhood has suggested the title of this paper. I think of it as the what-people-should-know series because that phrase appeared in the title of each of its books, the ones I recall being "What Every Young Boy Should Know," "What Every Young Girl Should Know," "What Every Young Mother Should Know." I don't remember having read any of them; but since I've been a professor of higher education, I've often thought that it might be both interesting and useful to be associated with the production of a similarly named series of volumes about colleges and universities. They'd be written on the one hand for the clienteles of institutions of higher education -- freshmen, their parents, etc. -- and on the other for the holders of various staff positions -- presidents, deans, department heads, and other such. Probably the most important of all these books would be that with the same title as this paper: "What Every Professor Should Know About American Higher Education."

Now obviously even in a paper as long as I've been instructed to make this one, it will be impossible to cover all the ground that could be traversed even in a short book, but I'll have a fling at sketching what seem to me to be the essentials. First, however, let me try to

HE008079

---

*A paper read before the Faculty of the College of Business Administration, University of Akron, October 28, 1960.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

relate what I hope to do in this paper with my reason for writing it and for being here at the University of Akron to read it. You have a grant from the Ford Foundation to help you to strengthen and to sharpen the activities of the staff and students of your College of Business Administration, and I have been invited to be the first of a succession of speaker-consultants to help you toward that end. My task, in the words that Dean Gardner wrote me, is to discuss "the development of a faculty, its obligations and duties, particularly in relationship to curriculum and instruction, and then the relationship of the faculty to an administrative organization." In short, I understand my assignment to be that of laying foundations upon which later speakers and consultants may build. I plan to do this in two ways: first, by describing some of the salient characteristics of colleges and universities, and second, by identifying some of the urgent educational problems that they and their staff members face.

A Bit of History

To begin with, I review some history on the premise that every professor ought to know something about why and when colleges and universities came upon the scene. Consider first the why. Institutions of higher learning have evolved from man's efforts to comprehend and to control his environment and himself. Over the long stretches of pre-history and history these efforts begat the medicine men and shamans of primitive peoples, the magi and priests of early civilizations, the sophists and philosophers of ancient Greece, the alchemists and astrologers of pre-modern Europe. In every society such men of learning have been not only the guardians of the knowledge and of the values by which it lives but also the teachers of oncoming generations. When they formed associations, the antecedents of present-day institutions of higher learning and higher education emerged.

The roots of today's American colleges and universities reach not only to the universities founded in western Europe in the eleventh and succeeding centuries but also to the institutions of advanced learning established in Hellenic Greece in the fourth century B.C., in Alexandria and other centers during the Hellenistic period, and in such Muslim cities as Cordova and Seville. In short, western higher education has a continuous history of over twenty-three centuries.

This fact has particular importance for people who teach in schools of business because one group of pre-medieval institutions offered courses in business administration, namely, those in Constantinople and other Byzantine cities. They operated, albeit intermittently, from the fourth century to the fifteenth; and large numbers of their students took courses preparing them to be lawyers and notaries, that is, in capacities where they would be closely associated with the thriving business of the Byzantine empire. Recall that during the Middle Ages the byzant constituted the prime medium of exchange throughout the Mediterranean Basin and perhaps even as far as England. Statistics aren't available, but it seems reasonable to conclude that many of the men who manipulated the byzant as well as Byzantine trade had been educated in its higher schools at Constantinople and related cities.

Of even more importance to business educators is the fact that the universities in medieval Italy also emphasized the subjects you teach. When the sailors and traders of the Italian city states began to challenge the economic hegemony of Byzantium, they too needed personnel trained in business law, accounting, and other commercial specialties. Thus the University of Bologna, which emerged about 1200, put major emphasis upon law and commerce. So did other Italian universities, and it will be recalled that a Venetian monk named Luca Paciolo (he was probably also a professor) wrote the earliest European work on bookkeeping. It appeared in 1494.

It would be interesting to trace the progress of training for business in universities and other European advanced schools and also their influence upon the founders of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce and of the many others that have been established since its beginnings in 1881. I seek only, however, to point out that your subject has venerable roots of which, I suggest, all members of your guild might well be better informed than those of my acquaintance. When professors of the so-called academic subjects criticize you as upstarts, you could and should point out that your antecedents reach back farther than most of theirs. For example, the classical languages achieved curricular status in the universities of England, France, and Germany several centuries after the establishment of courses in business subjects in Italian universities.

The rapid spread of awareness of the central importance of economics and commerces in human security and progress has given schools of business administration higher status than they've ever had before in American higher education. Criticism of their presence in the academic family has largely disappeared entirely or gone underground. I therefore say no more about the disparaging statements of not so long ago and move on to describe the organization of American colleges and universities. Professors spend their lives in these increasingly complex and increasingly vital social institutions, but about them they usually have less fundamental knowledge than people like me believe that they'd find useful.

The Organization of American Colleges and Universities

Organizationally American colleges and universities differ from one another in various relatively minor ways, but they differ profoundly from the institutions of higher learning in other countries and also from most other American social institutions. I shan't stop to detail these differences but, instead, point out that two separate but closely interlinked sub-topics must be dealt with in describing American academic organizations: first, government, and second, administration.

The terms I've just used to name these topics, I need to point out, have quite different meanings in colleges and universities than in business, in politics, and in the schools; and so, perforce, I must define them as I shall be using them. Academic government primarily relates to policy making and policy adjudication; academic administration relates to putting policies into operation. Here at the University of Akron, for example, your ultimate governing body is your Board of Directors whose nine members, if they understand their functions properly, do not participate in the implementation of the operational policies they establish: they leave administration to the President and his associates.

I've just referred to your Board of Directors as your "ultimate governing body," and I used the adjective "ultimate" for the reason that you probably have several faculty governing bodies -- one for each of your colleges and perhaps an all-university Faculty Senate or Academic Council. Such faculty governing bodies have extensive influence if not actual power in making institutional policy because during this century almost all lay boards have given them wide-ranging scope. Lay boards retain the veto power, but they seldom use it. Thus in establishing education and research policy as distinguished from fiscal and plant policy faculty members are today the real governors of American colleges and universities.

Both public and private colleges and universities follow this plan of procedure, but it has been pointedly criticised by Ruml and Morrison in their 1959 book entitled Memo to a College Trustee. These authors* have expressed their conviction that trustees should actively participate in making educational and research policy, and some reviewers of their book have recorded their agreement. On the other hand, a proportion of the professoriate believes that the concept of lay trusteeship should be abandoned and that colleges and universities should be governed entirely by professors. One of the most vigorous expressions of this point of view came from the pen of Thorstein Veblen in 1918 in a book entitled The Higher Learning in America. It has been republished twice, the last time in 1957.

The issues in this often bitterly debated problem of who should govern American colleges and universities cannot be assessed here, but I hope that questions about them will be asked in tomorrow's discussion session. Meanwhile I'd like to suggest that members of the faculties of schools of business administration ought in particular to be well informed on problems of academic government because today the majority of college and university trustees (or directors as you call them here at Akron) come from the business community and -- along with businessmen alumni -- can use your help in understanding more thoroughly how and why academic government differs so markedly from the business corporation practices with which they are familiar. The core of these differences lies in the long centuries of academic history which have given faculties both legal and traditional prerogatives in helping formulate institutional policy. Lay governing boards that have ignored or undervalued these deeply entrenched procedures have usually precipitated storms that have seriously damaged their institutions.

---

* Both have died since the publication of their book. Ruml, a Ph.D. in psychology, became a successful businessman and publicist. Morrison, a Ph.D. in political science, was Provost of Dartmouth College on whose Board of Trustees Ruml served.

The governing prerogatives of professors, it must be observed, put important responsibilities on all faculty members. To exercise their suffrage wisely they need broad views about the large problems and trends of their immediate institutions and of American higher education in general. Most faculty members, however, concentrate their attention on their own professional concerns and those of their departments and hence have insufficient information about the large fundamental questions facing higher educational institutions individually and collectively. A number of journals try to be of service here, but unfortunately professors by and large read only those concerned with their own disciplines. For thirty years I've been advocating and trying to promote the publication of a popularly written weekly or bi-weekly magazine which would publish luminous articles on higher educational topics as well as report its news; but although a market survey has demonstrated that such a magazine could attract enough readers and advertisers to be a financial success, sponsors have failed to appear. I'm convinced that someday such a magazine will be established, but meanwhile professors by and large must participate in making educational and research policy with the limited information now available even to those who desire to be well informed.

About the administrative division of the topic of college and university organization I need say relatively little because school of business faculty members know a good deal more about it than most of their colleagues in other university units. Until late in the nineteenth century American colleges and universities were all small; and they all operated with primitive administrative structures that typically consisted of a president, a treasurer-bursar, a registrar, and a clerk or two. A century ago Yale, the largest college in the country, enrolled about four hundred undergraduates and approximately the same number of professional school students; and no American university passed the five thousand mark until the time of the first World War. Thereafter and especially during the past three decades we've been experiencing an enrollment explosion that promises to continue, and thus greatly enlarged administrative staffs operating under considerably improved concepts have become inevitable.

These concepts, as you know better than I, have largely been adapted from the practices of business corporations which learned them chiefly from the management engineers like Frederick W. Taylor. One of

Taylor's young disciples. Morris L. Cooke, made the first efforts to bring functional management ideas into the academic world by means of his 1910 Carnegie Foundation study entitled "Industrial and Academic Efficiency"; but the big developments have come during the very recent past and often with the assistance of management consultants who primarily serve business and government.

I've worked with some of these consultants and have read the recommendations of others. Generally they seem not to comprehend the importance of professorial prerogatives in policy making or the anti-administration attitudes of many professors. Academics have always been individualists par excellence, and as such they characteristically prefer their own methods and hence incline toward ignoring if not thwarting those imposed by others. "They'd none of 'em be missed," many of them hold, if administrators departed the Groves of Academe.

Because of their expanding associations with business, the military, and government agencies fewer professors feel today as antagonistic toward administration as their predecessors of earlier periods; but in any case colleges and universities seem to me harder to administer than any other social institutions -- even opera companies -- not only because of the ingrained individualism of their chief personnel group but also because, unlike opera stars, professors have tenure. I have the strong impression, however, that recognition of the inescapable significance of good administration grows in all academic quarters and that, though management problems multiply in number and complexity, improved understanding and knowledge of organizational principles is spreading.

I imagine that in using your Ford grant you'll be having a look at the governmental and administrative methods of your own college and perhaps of the University of Akron as a whole. Professors of business subjects have wider experience in organizational matters than most other professors, and thus your resolutions of the problems you identify could have utility beyond your own immediate boundaries. As I understand them, the purposes of the grant, however, relate more to curricular and instructional issues than to administration; and so I now move on to their consideration. In due course I'll be relating them to administration.

The Functions and Purposes of American Colleges and Universities

The sub-title above registers the fact that I consider functions and purposes to be different. The distinction between them seems to me to be so important that I need to enlarge upon it briefly.

One of my students recently completed a skillful analysis of the several meanings given by scientists and social scientists to the term *function*, and his study has given support to a definition -- different from that used by most social scientists -- that I have been using for the past decade or so, namely, a function is a *characteristic* activity of a structure. Otherwise expressed, a function is something that a thing, person, or group of persons *does*. A purpose, on the other hand, is an expressed *intention* of one or more human beings to do something. Thus a person may intend to walk to town -- that is, his purpose is to walk to town -- but not until he actually begins to take physical action does he perform the function of walking.

The above example illustrates the grammatical device by means of which functions can be distinguished from purposes. People generally state purposes as infinitives, functions as gerunds. Hence "to walk" is a purpose, but "walking" is a function. Similarly with colleges and universities: their purposes are often stated as "to provide instruction," "to promote education," "to advance knowledge." But the providing, the promoting, and the advancing of education and knowledge constitute their functions.

Since functions and purposes -- though interlinked -- differ, they can profitably be discussed separately; and I've found it more useful in studying colleges and universities to begin with functions and then to try to identify the purposes or intentions that activate them. What are the functions of colleges and universities? What do they do? Theodore Caplow, a sociologist who has recently left the University of Minnesota for Columbia, has listed some of them in the following statement taken from one of his unpublished manuscripts:

> . . . the program of the University of Minnesota includes -- besides a vast amount of teaching and research -- the operation of a broadcasting station, an airfield, a chemical storehouse, a daily newspaper, a fruit orchard, archaeological excavations, a symphony orchestra, a theater, an iron mine, forests, a kindergarten, many libraries, many farms, art galleries, a carnival, a hospital, a morgue, a fleet of trucks, a power station, museums, an armory, an ice skating rink, a student government, a police force, restaurants and hotels, a telephone network, a streetcar line, magazines, an accounting system, and much else besides -- all related more or less to the essential task of accumulating and transmitting knowledge. Towards a Theory of Organizational Interaction, 12.3.

To deal productively with this and comparable listings of the activities or functions of colleges and universities one must, I suggest, decide upon some method of classifying them; and my efforts in this direction have led me to employ the following three-fold classificatory system:

1. Raison d'Etre or Core Functions: These functions consist of the activities for which colleges and universities essentially exist, and they seem to me to total only two: education and research. Incidentally, I use a French word here because unfortunately the English language seems not to have a term of comparable clarity. I could, of course, translate the French term into the English hyphenated word "reason-for-existence," but that seems cumbersome and probably unnecessary. The word "core," however, approaches being synonymous.
2. Complementary Functions: Those consist of activities which colleges and universities perform to supplement or complement their raison d'etre functions. The Caplow list quoted above includes a number of them: operating broadcasting stations, hospitals, orchestras and theaters, iron mines, etc. Colleges and universities do not essentially exist to do any of these things, but they complement their raison d'etre functions of education and investigation.
3. Self-Continuity Functions: Like all social institutions colleges and universities must engage in a wide range of activities in order to continue in existence. They must raise money and account for its use, erect buildings and maintain them, set up administration systems and staff them, etc. Colleges and universities do not exist to do these things per se, and hence they are means and not ends in themselves. Some people, by the way, call these the "maintenance functions"; but because of the usual limitation of the word "maintenance" to plant upkeep I prefer the more dramatic term "self-continuity."

In a thorough assessment of the functions of a higher educational institution or of all of them taken together, one would need to examine all three of these categories; but since that's obviously impossible now, I limit myself to the two raison d'etre functions of education and investigation. This involves indicating the forms that each of the functions takes and then identifying the purposes they serve.

The Three Forms or Kinds of Teaching and of Research: Colleges and universities perform their educational function both formally and informally, that is, they offer courses of instruction, and they also provide extracurricular opportunities for students to be educated as whole people and not just as minds. Time and space limit me to the discussion of formal education or teaching. It falls into three categories that correspond with three associated kinds of research. Before I name and enlarge upon them, I need to petition your toleration of some new terminology; and since people guy educationists for coining new words, I want to read a short passage from the syllabus of my course at Stanford in which I introduce these terms. It defends the right of educationists to use a specialized vocabulary and, further, fights back at those who scoff at people who do. It reads:

> The critics of the vocabulary of educationists seem to be saying that we who are concerned professionally with education have no right to use any words except those in common use. We must, in brief, employ only garden-variety words. To this prohibition I for one respond "poppycock."
>
> Educationists can't be hobbled in any such fashion. Their subject has been characterized by Kant as one of the two "most difficult of human inventions" (the other being government), by Spencer as "the subject which involves all other subjects," and by Dewey as "the most complex, intricate, and subtle of all human enterprises."
>
> If these statements can be credited, it follows that the study of education requires the attention of specialists who among themselves

> at least must use a specialized vocabulary. When the physicist abandons his isotopes, the biologist his enzymes, the geologist his phacoliths, the anthropologist his phonemes, the grammarian his gerundial genitives, then and then only will -- indeed can -- students of education limit themselves to the vocabulary of the living room and the dinner table.

Here, then, are the names of the three kinds of teaching cited early in the last paragraph: logocentric teaching, practicentric teaching, and democentric teaching. You all recognize the stem "centric" as meaning "centered in"; but perhaps I need to explain the prefixes. Logo refers to knowledge, practi to practice, and demo to people. Hence logocentric teaching concentrates on the training of people who plan to be intense students of a subject and as such devoted to extending its frontiers; it is teaching concerned with understanding the nature of the universe and of man. Practicentric teaching trains practitioners of any art -- agriculture, business, law, medicine, psychiatric social work, and the uncountable number of others. Finally democentric teaching interprets for people in general -- that is, for non-specialists -- the work and findings of logocentrists and practicentrists; it seeks to give them an intelligent but not thorough understanding of a subject.

These three new terms have this virtue if no other: they correlate, and each therefore suggests the other two. No less important, they call attention to the interdependence and also to the need of all three types of teaching Knowledge and society stand still without logocentric teaching. The vocations could not recruit new members or improve their methods without practicentric teaching. The range of interest and sensitivity of each of us, in turn, depends in large measure upon the amount and quality of the democentric teaching from which we've profited.

The three names I've introduced also apply to kinds of research, and the literature about research enterprises recognises two of them although under different names. What I call logocentric research generally goes by the names of "pure," "basic," and "fundamental" research; and what I call practicentric research people usually denominate "applied research." I prefer and employ my trio of terms, however, for three reasons. First, the adjectives "pure," "basic," and "fundamental" imply that so-called applied research is impure or of secondary importance; but the term "logocentric research" carries no such aspersive connotations and hence does not disparage practicentric research. Second, the trio makes a place for democentric research which I consider of immense importance in relationship to democentric teaching and about which I shall have more to say later on. Third, as already remarked, the three terms are correlative and suggest each other.

Referring to the music of Richard Wagner, Nietzsche once observed that people have poor ears for new music; and so these terms may not at first sound pleasant or otherwise desirable. I've been using them for about a decade with my students, and among them they have taken hold because of their utility in distinguishing among the kinds of teaching and research undertaken by college and university faculty members. I hope that you'll not find them too disconcerting as I use them throughout the rest of this paper. Assuming your tolerance, I proceed to the task of searching out the purposes behind the three varieties of teaching and the three varieties of research.

The Core Purpose of Formal Teaching: Societies educate, I suggest, for three interweaving purposes: (1) to ensure their physical continuity or survival, (2) to protect their conceptions of social order, and (3) to inculcate in their members the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for its security and stability. Anthropologists are coming to call the processes involved in the third of these purposes *enculturation*, another new term that I hope you'll find palatable. In any case, enculturation denotes the putting into a society's members and also drawing out of them the characteristics which the society needs to survive and to thrive. Further, it constitutes the core purpose of all teaching, a point which must now be enlarged upon.

Each of the three kinds of teaching cited earlier focusses upon a particular variety of enculturation. Graduate schools train most American logocentrists, and they primarily concentrate their attention upon teaching the knowledge and skills and also developing the attitudes needed by those who will later engage in the business of seeking to extend the boundaries of knowledge. Professional schools such as your own College of Business Administration, on the other hand, train practicentrists and look to the graduate school of arts and sciences to develop the new knowledge in economics and in the other subjects underlying the business arts. In brief, the graduate schools enculturate their students as logocentrists, and professional schools enculturate their students as practicentrists.

For the present only two observations need to be made about democentric enculturation. First, democentric teachers are a unique kind of practicentrist whose function is to transmit the general knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed by all of us as people rather than as specialised workers. Second, the graduate schools have been assigned responsibility for their training but acknowledge this responsibility so reluctantly and do so poorly with it that I'll be saying more on this score later. The purposes permeating the three kinds of research must meanwhile be discussed.

The Purposes Animating Research: All varieties of teachers engage in the task of *distributing* knowledge, and all varieties of research people engage in the associated task of *producing* knowledge. The paramount purpose of logocentric researchers is to produce new knowledge without stopping to consider whether or not it has practical utility. They seek to *understand*, and they leave to others the business of applying the concepts and facts they reconnoiter. For example, Einstein devoted his career to seeking and proposing answers to problems that for many decades had puzzled physicists and astronomers; but when the military potential of atomic energy became apparent to him and his associates, they had to turn over to engineers and applied physicists the work of designing and building the atomic bomb.

The crucial purpose of practicentric researchers, therefore, is to apply the knowledge created or discovered by logocentrists. Their activities lead to the production of the appliable knowledge upon which modern civilization depends for survival and progress. Thus James Watt, the instrument-maker who worked for Professor Joseph Black at the University of Glasgow, combined the logocentric knowledge of heat which Black developed with his own knowledge of mechanics to invent the modern steam engine; engineers have applied new mathematical knowledge to create today's complex computers; and production men in factories have employed the findings of psychologists, physiologists, and other logocentrists to contrive improved manufacturing processes.

The widespread use of the terms pure and applied research testifies to the general recognition of their importance and of their purposes, but what about democentric research? Unfortunately, few people even acknowledge its existence, never mind its purposes. Especially because I shall later be making a recommendation concerning its place here in your College of Business Administration, its importance and the purposes it serves need to be clarified.

Before the onset of the deluge of new knowledge that has spawned modern society, teachers merely rehashed old information, and their students memorized it. William James, who opened up new roads in philosophy, for example, told once about a graduate student who complained that he couldn't understand him; and this led James to ask whether he understood his undergraduate professor of philosophy. "Oh, yes," responded the student, "he made us commit his doctrines to memory." These historical methods of teaching have proved inadequate and even disasterous, but the stereotype of the teacher as a purveyor of antiquated information unhappily continues. Less and less do people apply the stereotype to logocentric and practicentric teachers, but I often hear professors in graduate and professional schools cite it to denigrate teachers of general education or democentric courses. Democentric teachers, who don't engage in logocentric and practicentric research, they say in effect, of necessity grow stale and unproductive and hence purvey antiquated knowledge. With this point of view I disagree heartily, and I must explain why.

Recall from an earlier page the identification of the function of democentric teachers as the interpretation "for people in general -- that is, for non-specialists -- the work and findings of logocentrists and practicentrists." Behind this function -- this increasingly crucial function in modern life -- stands the purpose of the enlightenment of the citizenry, that is, of the people whose knowledge and opinions ultimately decide public policy including those relating to the support of the logocentric and practicentric activities of universities. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, democentrist teachers devote their energies to "the general enlightenment of the people"; and if this be their task, then it follows that these teachers should themselves be enlightened. They cannot be, I maintain, unless they do research that harmonises with their function and its undergirding purpose of general enlightenment.

Such research consists in keeping in constant touch with the data and conclusions of the logocentrists and practicentrists in their own and related disciplines and organising it for communication in terms understandable to the people who want or need such knowledge. For example, President Emeritus James B. Conant of Harvard has pointed out with vigor in his book On Understanding Science and in other writings that science will probably fail to get the support it needs unless some scientists take on the job of explaining it to all the rest of us. The Spanish philosopher Ortega in his brilliant little book The Mission of the University has written to the same effect and has also declared that unless universities put considerably more emphasis upon democentric teaching, the world will before long be populated by highly trained barbarians who, specialists in their own narrow fields, lack the knowledge and hence the ability to communicate with one another. He took his degree at the University of Berlin, by the way, and he predicted the Hitler regime because, among other things, of the failure of German universities to attend to democentric teaching.

Sound democentric teaching requires, I would emphasize, democentric research. Without it, democentric teachers justify the stereotype of purveyors of antiquated information. As observed earlier, however, the graduate schools largely ignore their assignment to train people in democentric research with the unhappy result that democentric teaching has low status and considerably lower quality on the average than logocentric and practicentric teaching.

Some Generalizations and Recommendations

I fear that what I have written thus far may strike you as highly abstract, and I must therefore now relate it to your enterprise of using your Ford grant to step up your teaching, research, and administrative processes. My interests in the study of higher education are primarily logocentric, but I constantly point out to my students that the ultimate utility of the logocentrist lies in his contributions to the range of understanding of people in general and especially to the work of practicentrists. Thus all my courses are built upon the point of view expressed in an epigram written by Thomas H. Huxley which reads: "The great end of life is not knowledge but action."

You are beginning upon a project requiring a plan of action, and at this stage I imagine that you're primarily concerned with perfecting your plan. Toward this end I should like to name and to discuss what appear to me to be the factors that your plan should encompass.

First, purpose. Would it not be desirable to agree upon a succinct statement of the purpose of your enterprise? Perhaps one has already been written; and if so, comparing it with that proposed by an outsider like me might be useful. A purpose, recall from earlier pages, differs from a function and is preferably stated in sentences employing infinitives. Thus it seems to me that the purpose of your project could be stated this way: the Ford grant shall be used to strengthen and to improve all the processes of the College of Business Administration of the University of Akron toward the end of producing better products.

This statement includes three variables that need to be amplified. The infinitive "to strengthen" expresses the thought that some of your processes -- perhaps many -- have demonstrated their worth and need only to be reinforced. In turn the infinitive "to improve" suggests that others probably need to be amended. You'll make faster and greater progress, perhaps you'll agree, if at the outset you spot these points of strength and weakness. In any case, the word "processes" specifies the second variable, and about it I shall be saying more later. First, however, I'd like to enlarge upon the third variable, namely, "products."

The work of every college and university, I think you'll agree, yields two primary kinds of products -- people and knowledge. Each of these has at least two subdivisions. The "people products" include not only alumni who carry the brand name of their alma maters and whose performance reflects the quality of the formal and informal education they have had, but they also include the individuals served in short courses, in lectures, and in consultation activities. The latter become increasingly important for all professional schools and especially for schools of business administration.

Their "knowledge products" constitute, first, the information that your faculty members develop for use in their teaching, and second, the new knowledge which may or may not have immediate utility in teaching or in advancing the general understanding and practices of their fields of interest.* Both in the long run and the short, colleges and universities are judged not by their stated purposes but instead, by both their people and their knowledge products. Hence you may think it desirable to examine the quality of both these varieties of your products and their subdivisions. Indeed I urge such a study because of the lights that it will throw on your processes. To the discussion of these I now turn.

You have perhaps noticed that in earlier pages I used the word "function" and that I've switched to the word "process." The reason needs stating. A function is the name of a characteristic activity of a structure; but functioning -- that is, the activity per se -- consists in a sequence of intermeshing activities occurring in a definite manner. These intermeshing activities are processes. Thus walking is the name of a kind of human and animal locomotion, and it consists in various muscular and related processes. I've listed what I believe to be the three categories of college and university functions, and each of them subsumes a large number of processes. Important though they are, I can't here say anything about the complementary functions and their processes and much less than I'd like about the processes involved in the raison d'etre and self-continuity groups of functions. Time, in fact, limits me to the discussion of only some of the processes involved in teaching, research, and organisation.

---

*Parenthetically may I observe that some new knowledge developed by faculty members has very limited utility as for example the protracted research of a Yale professor of English, cited by Henry Seidel Canby, concerned with one of Aesop's fables: he compared all the medieval manuscripts that he could locate "tracing their indebtedness one to another by the use of 'wolf' for 'fox' or the peculiarity in the ass that wore the lion's skin." This research got the investigator a full professorship, but it had little other value.

The teaching process involves at least a score of variables* only six of which I can comment on: the teacher, the body of knowledge which he organises for his teaching, the objects of his instruction be they students in his classes or members of extramural groups, the methods he employs, the equipment he uses, and the products of his teaching. Unfortunately what I can say about these six variables must of necessity be brief.

Teachers differ in an infinitude of ways, but the one factor that seems to be most significant of all is each teacher's interest in giving -- and his ability to give -- students the kind of instruction they need at their present stage of development. I mean here that it strikes me as folly to assign a teacher with logocentric interests to a group of students who want practicentric or democentric instruction -- and vice versa. Yet all colleges and universities do this. For example, some years ago a distinguished Cornell chemist pointed out that introductory courses in science seldom met the needs of students who want a general (that is, democentric) understanding of such subjects as chemistry because courses in chemistry were then -- and generally are now -- designed for students who plan to take advanced courses in the subject. This situation prevails not only in the sciences but also generally, and it brings to mind the boy who asked his mother: "What is a penguin?" "It's some sort of an anarctic bird, I think, but ask your father." "No thanks," said the boy, "I don't want to know that much." Students who want a general understanding of a subject don't want and don't need to know as much about it as logocentrically and practicentrically trained teachers typically, I suggest, try to convey to them.

---

*In an article published in the November, 1953 issue of Improving College and University Teaching and entitled "A Century of College Teaching" I reviewed ten of the variables involved in college teaching, but at least twice as many need attention.

Might it not be useful in your enterprise to discover whether or not the properly qualified teachers are assigned to all your courses and whether, further, you need to organize differential sections in some of your subjects? For example, the student who upon graduating plans to be a personnel man probably would profit more from a primarily democentric course in accounting than from the practicentric course that I understand they typically take in colleges of business administration. By the same token the practicentric student of accounting probably gains little and suffers much by being taught by a professor whose interests are logocentric and who therefore usually talks over the heads of students who plan to be practicing accountants and not pioneering theoreticians.

A good professional school faculty, I have long believed, resembles a good baseball club with its balanced ensemble of infielders, outfielders, pitchers, and catchers. Professional school faculties similarly need logocentrists, practicentrists, and democentrists; and, despite widespread faculty opinion, the least of these aren't the democentrists since they are the people who interpret your lore to non-specialists both among your students and your various publics. In any case, the three varieties of teachers draw upon the same body of knowledge; but they must organize it quite differently if they are adequately to serve the needs of their differing kinds of students and public audiences.

This observation brings the third teaching variable into focus, namely, the objects of a professor's teaching, that is, his students and his other clients be they individuals he serves as a consultant or extramural groups to which he speaks. Concerning these -- and particularly concerning the members of his regular courses -- the typical teacher of today seems to know less than his predecessors because of the increased size of classes and also because he realizes that he'll almost certainly be judged for raises in rank and salary on his research and consultation activities more than on the quality of his classroom teaching. Thus American colleges and universities today become increasingly impersonal and therefore in my belief less effective. This may not be the situation here at Akron, but you may think it desirable to have a look at the personal relations of faculty members with students.

Concerning the many-sided topic of methods of teaching, time permits comments on only one of its facets, namely, the widely held point of view -- fostered by the graduate schools in particular -- that if a person knows a subject he can ipso facto teach it. I've never encountered a faculty anywhere, however, that did not include professors whose teaching belies this dogma. Further, no other field of endeavor of which I know honors its counterpart. Medical schools teach courses in medical and surgical methods, law schools in legal procedures, divinity schools in homiletics and pastoral counseling, etc. College and university teachers seem to be the only top-level professional people in our society who are permitted to learn the skills of their craft by the sink-or-swim method.

I believe with conviction that this situation must be changed, but I don't want to give the impression that I advocate methods courses in college teaching comparable to those taught for school teachers. I do believe, however, that valuable programs can and should be established to assist intending college and university teachers to prepare for their life's work. Perhaps during tomorrow's discussion session you'll let me enlarge a bit on what I have in mind. Meanwhile may I cite the great strides being made in improving the teaching of mathematics as the result of studies made with funds from the Carnegie Corporation. Given the necessary interest and money, what has been accomplished in this subject could undoubtedly be duplicated across the curricular board. The recently published books on business education written by Pierson and by Gordon and Howell have considerably increased the interest in teaching methods in your field, and perhaps they will lead to significant methodological changes here at Akron and elsewhere.

This brings the discussion to the fifth of the six variables I've named -- equipment. Not so long ago college teachers in subjects other than the sciences typically used only blackboards and chalk, but today the furor about teaching machines and instruction by TV symbolizes a change that has been coming for a long while and that will unquestionably accelerate. May it not be in order, therefore, for you to give thought to equipment matters in your review of your operations here?

Perhaps I've said enough already about the sixth variable, namely, your "people products." I'll therefore bypass it here except to quote the twentieth verse of the seventh chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew: "By their fruits ye shall know them."

I must also be succinct in discussing research. Variables abound here too, but instead of commenting upon its processes perhaps I can be of more service by returning briefly to the topic of the relationship of research to teaching.

The literature of higher education teems with pronouncements about the conflict between the teaching and research functions. They do in fact frequently collide, but after many years of ferreting into and fretting about these collisions I've come to the conclusion that they need not occur and, indeed, would not if properly related. I mean that a solution to the conflicts seems to me to be possible through the acceptance of two premises. They are these: first, that every teacher should do research, and second, that the kind of research he does should harmonize with the kind of teaching he does. I shan't stop to discuss the first premise since most people in higher education accept it -- or at least pay lip service to it -- and also because those who don't would, I believe, if they could assent to the second. I therefore repeat the second premise for emphasis: the kind of research a faculty member does should harmonize with the kind of teaching he does.

The essential terms in this proposition are "kind of teaching" and "kind of research"; and in earlier pages I've identified three of each, to wit, logocentric, practicentric, and democentric. If these two series of activities can in fact be differentiated, then it seems to me that the nature of the problem of relating them becomes clearer and, moreover, the solution easier. The solution, I suggest, lies in seeing that logocentric teachers are assigned only to logocentric courses, that only logocentric students be permitted to enroll in them, and that the same principle of combining likes rather than unlikes be followed in practicentric and democentric instruction.

Is this a workable plan here at Akron? I very much hope that we can explore this question tomorrow. Your judgment of it will at least be helpful to me in checking the validity of my hypothesis. Meanwhile, since I must soon bring this prolix paper to a close, I conclude by touching upon the organizational processes which particularly affect teaching and research.

Many pages back I distinguished between academic government and academic administration. Concerning the former I have four comments. First, that I hope you believe as I do that it's desirable for laymen to participate in making educational and research policy. Second, that if you do, you will audit your methods of using the services of members of your business community in carrying your work to higher ground. Third, that you'll not allow your own legal and traditional rights in academic government to rust because of preoccupation with research and teaching, a point that may seem unnecessary if not amusing but which I stress because I know of not a few institutions in which strong administrators give faculty members little opportunity to participate in decision making. And fourth, that you give intensive thought to your committee structure for the reason that every faculty of which I know suffers from excessive committee work. If professors are to participate in decision making, some committees are inevitable; but in my judgment the number of committees in all of them could be reduced with beneficial results all round.

About administrative process I also have four points. First, that although other definitions prevail elsewhere, in the academic world administration means operational responsibility for the performance of the functions of colleges and universities. The ultimate responsibility for American higher educational institutions rests with their legal entities, that is, with their external governing boards; but they have assigned operational responsibility to presidents and their staffs. The abounding individualism of professors and also the belief strongly held by some of them that both trustees and administrators have been imposed upon them against their best interests and also those of colleges and universities frequently becloud the nature of academic administration and, moreover, frustrate administrative activities. Nonetheless, the public, trustees, and professors hold presidents -- and in turn deans and other second-line administrators -- responsible for operational failures and inadequacies. The short average tenure of presidents in particular witnesses this fact.

Second, academic administration involves three major functions -- superintendence, facilitation, and development. The first of these, sometimes called "supervision," administrators in colleges and universities generally do little about because of the deep-seated individualism and anti-administration attitudes of many professors. What little they do, therefore, they accomplish largely through persuasion and indirection. They have few of the powers of administrators in most other social enterprises, and this seems to me to make academic administration infinitely more difficult than business management and most other kinds of executive work.

I've never known professors to object to the second administrative function of facilitation as it relates, at least, to material considerations. Indeed, some think of administrators as being entirely academic housekeepers responsible for such chores as getting their salary checks to them on time, scheduling classes, buying and distributing supplies, etc. Happily this view has a diminishing number of adherents, but unfortunately too-large proportions of both professors and administrators still cling to it.

The third administrative function of development has two primary subdivisions -- money-raising and program development. The first of necessity grows in importance; but the more time that administrators devote to it, the less time they have for the second. The outstanding administrators, however, not only raise money but also work hard and successfully at determining how it shall be used. Time doesn't permit the citing of examples, but perhaps I can name some tomorrow.

The third general observation I'd like to make about administration is brief but infinitely important. It's this: that administration is a means and not an end in itself. I've been making some critical remarks about professorial attitudes concerning administration, but here I'm being critical of the administrators who overlook the fact that society does not support colleges and universities in order that they may be administered. Some administrators I've known seem to have forgotten this insistent fact with unhappy results both for their associates and their institutions.

Top-level administrators -- and this is my fourth and final comment about administration -- are expected to be leaders and not just superintendents and facilitators. Behind every great development in American higher education throughout its three centuries of history has stood an administrative leader -- a president, dean, or department head. These men have often been poor at both superintendence and facilitation and have had the good sense to assign these functions to subordinates so that they could concentrate on designing and building improved programs. Such men are worth their weight in any precious metal that can be named. The future of American higher education -- as, indeed, of all our social institutions -- depends more, I verily believe, on the quality of its leadership than upon any other consideration.

- - - - -

~~I~~ I've seven-league booted over so much ground in this paper that I blanch at the task of summarizing it. I return, therefore, to the place I started: to my suggestion that it might be desirable to have available for professors a book with the title "What Every Professor Should Know About American Higher Education." In this paper I've indicated some of the topics that could be included in such a book, and in the process I've tried to raise questions for discussion tomorrow. I'll know then whether or not what I've written has been useful to you in planning how to employ the funds granted you by the Ford Foundation.